

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1873.

I.—OUR REPRESENTATIVE RELIGIONS.

THE various religious sects of America can, as regards their modes of thought and general characteristics, be reduced to four types: the Methodists, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, and the Unitarians. These correspond to, and illustrate, the four principal elements of our nature: the Methodists, passion; the Episcopalians, taste; the Presbyterians, reason; and the Unitarians, intuition; and they are, to some extent, the necessary outgrowth of the religious thought in any country where all religions are free.

In accordance with these general characteristics, the Methodists are energetical and practical, the Episcopalians æsthetical and elegant, the Presbyterians logical and scholastic, and the Unitarians philosophical and original. The Methodists are characterized by good sense, the Episcopalians by good taste, the Presbyterians by good learning, and the Unitarians by good thought. The Methodist can be said to be the people's Church, the Episcopalian the fashionable Church, the Presbyterian the scholars' Church, and the Unitarian the thinkers' Church.

Having in mind these distinctions, we shall attempt, in this paper, to elaborate the general character of each of these denominations, commencing with the Methodists.

The most prominent feature of the Methodists is their practicalness. They always adopt appropriate and adequate means to proposed ends, and do it with the same business-like tact and energy

which characterize men in secular affairs. They never make it a question of how the ancients did things, or even of how the apostles or Christ did them; but they would rather borrow a useful thing any day from the world than a useless one from the Church. They have, accordingly, broken off from all ecclesiastical ways and airs, and support no useless traditional machinery or forms—no fifth wheels—however hallowed by time or usage. On the other hand, they make use of all modern inventions and devices to carry on their work: the press, with its gigantic book concerns and countless periodicals; the American educational system, with its colleges and seminaries in almost every town; corporations and stock companies, to carry forward missionary and Church extension enterprises; national organizations for Christian perfection; women's societies for aiding the pastors; conventions and institutes for Sunday-school work; conference associations for life insurance and for support of the aged and orphans, etc. Their whole Church economy, in fact, is of modern invention, and far more effective than any thing of ecclesiastical traditions: as their itinerancy, by which they supply every place in the country with a preacher, and every body who wants to preach with a place; their local preachers' system, by which they get men of all professions to preach occasionally who can not be induced to preach exclusively, and to preach for nothing when they have no money to pay them; their system of exhorters, by which they get men who will not preach at all, to take charge of meetings, and to exhort, which is only another name for more effective preaching; their class-meetings, by which they get others still at work, both as preachers and as pastors, and get all the Church members to speak more or less on religion; their prayer-meetings, where every body is expected to pray, and, if need be, to exhort or preach; their special revival services, where personal effort is required even of the sinner, and where every one charged with passion can fire off. In short, the Methodist idea is to press every body into the active service, the women as well as the men; for the women take part in all these meetings, speaking in class-meeting, praying in prayer-meeting, and often preaching from the pulpit.

In the next place, the Methodists are characterized by their directness. They always take the shortest way to do a thing. They have no long, tiresome routes from the means to the end, which make you

forget what you are after. Their service is the simplest of all Church services, and is not stereotyped to be always used, whether needed or not, but changes with the occasion. Their sermons and exhortations come warm from the heart to the people, instead of being first factured in private, to be read after they are cold. Their texts and subjects are not taken from an accidental Scripture lesson, but chosen according to the wants of the occasion. Their prayers are not determined by the fact that St. James or St. Nicholas was born on that day of the year, some fifteen centuries ago; nor their amens put at immovable places, with clerks paid to pronounce or sing them; but every body prays what he thinks, and says amen to what he feels. In short, the preachers and people are entirely free, being under no restraint, either as to what or how they shall do.

In the next place, the Methodists are pre-eminently a secular Church. They study almost any thing rather than theology. Their ministers are better acquainted with political economy and the latest newspapers than with Church literature. They are more skilled in horse-trading and land speculation than in exegetical analysis. In their service, they have no special ecclesiastical garments, and do not even wear white cravats or long coat-tails or devout faces. Their churches are more like secular buildings than ecclesiastical structures, resembling a railroad depot or a theater. And no matter how they look, they do not reverence them any more than they would a barn. They are beginning to build them with kitchens and parlors, to serve for festivals and parties. They sometimes build them into business blocks, and rent part of them out for law-offices and milliner-shops. In the Clark-street Church, of Chicago, the main audience-room is on the third and fourth stories. The Charles-street congregation, of Baltimore, contemplate raising their Church fifty or sixty feet in the air, and putting a business block under it. At Omaha, they are in a similar speculation. They do not name their Churches after saints or sacred objects, but after the streets or something secular. Instead of St. Paul's Church, or St. Martin's, or the Church of the Annunciation, it is John-street Church, Mount Vernon Place Church, Memorial Church, Centenary Church, Union Church, etc. If they name them after persons, it is somebody now living, or not long dead, generally a favorite pastor or politician, as the (Judge) M'Lean Church, Morris Chapel, Asbury Church, Wesley, or Hayden Chapel, Lincoln

Church, Alexander Dumas Society, etc. They often preach in halls and market-places and on the docks, and find it quite as congenial as in sanctified places. Their last General Conference was held in a theater. A Methodist minister will often crack a joke or take a chew of tobacco in the pulpit. There is generally a spittoon kept near by for him, and always a pitcher of water and glass, all of which would seem much out of place in an Episcopalian or Presbyterian Church. And sometimes great placards are hung up through the congregation, with the words, not "The Lord is in his holy temple," but "Gentlemen are requested not to use tobacco."

Again: the Methodist is pre-eminently a present Church. Its work and interests are all now. Methodists have no concern whether their Church is the same as the ancient Church, or whether it is derived from it, or whether its ministers have succeeded to the apostles. They don't trouble themselves, as do the Episcopalians, about defending the ancient Church or ancient Christians, but let them stand or fall on their own merits. Their Church, moreover, changes every four years, when it is cut off anew from the past. At the Tyng trial, an Episcopalian minister asked a Methodist for his Book of Discipline. When the latest edition—that of 1864—was given him, he inquired, "Where are your previous authorities?" The Methodist answered, "All of Methodism is in 1864." The Methodist Church is as different from what it was in the days of Wesley as from what it will be in the twentieth century; so that it is amusing to see Episcopalians try to convert Methodists by proving that Wesley was an Episcopalian, or Congregationalists arguing against their episcopacy because Wesley did not approve of it. The Methodists do not care any more for Wesley's opinion than for St. Dominic's or St. Paul's on such subjects. In their preaching, too, the Methodists are modern, even to the latest telegraphic quotations. They often preach on the newest sensation, or on Huxley's or Rénan's theory, instead of dwelling on Simon Peter's wife's mother or the sycamore-tree up which Zachæus climbed. They discourse on General Grant's last message rather than on the decree of Nebuchadnezzar. They talk about the United States rather than about Judea; about petroleum rather than about frankincense. They attack the sins of New York and of 1873 rather than of Jerusalem and of antediluvian times. And they do this though it is breaking off from all Church precedent and

ecclesiastical propriety. In all things they change with the time, and give themselves entirely up to the present, throwing themselves into the live questions which constitute the spirit of the age. The Methodist preacher believes in making himself one of the people among whom he lives, on the ground that a man in another age can not successfully preach to this.

In the next place, the Methodists are a political Church. Their passionate, practical, and secular nature impels them to this. In our present politics, they are Republicans, and at all times they are ranged on the more progressive side. There is nothing conservative about them. During the war, they were Union men; the few copperheads among them generally seceding, or getting put out for disloyalty. In the Union Church, of St. Louis, the pastor used to require all applicants for membership to take the oath of allegiance. The Methodist Church, far more than any other, suffered by losses and splits during the war; for a Methodist always thinks far more of his country than of his Church. In the South, this same characteristic showed itself, where the Methodists espoused the cause of their section, and were the first, most unanimous, and most rabid in the Rebellion. The Methodists fought over slavery long before any other Church thought of it, and had split the Church in two twenty years before the politicians tried to split the nation on the same issue.

Another peculiarity of the Methodists is, that they are not strongly attached to the Church. They stick in it loosely, and give it but little of their thought. They always think more of the objects they are after, whether political or religious, than of the Church. They have no great power to keep their converts; but more are lost to them every year than would fill all the other Churches. They do not instruct them in Methodist doctrines, but give them over to the world as soon as converted. They have no high idea of a Church in any sense, and do not think that uniting with the Church amounts to any thing morally, or that uniting with the Methodist Church is better than uniting with any other. They rarely proselyte, and would about as soon that people were good outside of Church as in it. They open their doors wide enough for any body, however young or ignorant or unorthodox, to enter, and they leave them open for any body to go out. They take every body into Church with the understanding that it is only for six months, and that he can go out any time during the

trial period without notice. As showing how little they care for their Church organization, they are divided into no less than eleven sects, which have broken off on the slightest provocations, and remain on good terms, none of them caring for a reunion. There are also many independent Methodist Churches and preachers belonging to no organization whatever. A Methodist preacher often leaves his own denomination for another, sometimes temporarily, and sometimes permanently, not because of any change of opinion, but because he thinks there is no difference in which Church he works.

Again: the Methodist Church is a Church of reforms; not so much of reforms in favor of distant ideals as of reforms against prevailing evils and sins, such as slavery, intemperance, theater-going, dancing, tobacco-chewing, etc.; reforms that are immediate and personal,—herein differing from the Unitarians, who purpose great schemes for humanity to solve, without any appliances to bring them home to individuals. They push these reforms with a zeal that endangers the Church itself. We have already seen how they have acted in regard to slavery and politics generally. A whole conference will sometimes declare itself so strongly against dancing, card-playing, and other amusements, as to frighten away nearly all the young people. The Minnesota Conference recently refused to admit any body to its membership who uses tobacco, caring more for reform in tobacco than for prosperity in the Church. The late General Conference declared all members dealing in liquor, whether as distillers, bar-keepers, or drinkers, to be subject to disciplinary action. Very often a conference resolves, *en masse*, to oppose all political candidates who drink or favor license laws. A Church often turns out its wealthiest members for occasional drinking or dancing; not because they are unfit for the Church, but because they exert a bad influence. The Methodists mean to break down these evils whether it break the Church or not. In short, they think more about the ends they have to accomplish than about the Church, which is a means to accomplish them. Herein they are the opposites of the Episcopalians, who hold Church first, and morals and salvation afterward.

On the whole, the Methodist Church will be seen to be a great organization, moving on the world for definite and powerful results, striking where there is most to be done, and not caring for whether nerves or Churches or nations are shattered; or whether it may not

itself be lost in the magnitude of its own results. The Methodist Church is often called the great drag-net which sweeps through all waters, and sweeps every thing into its folds. But, while it is a big net, it has big meshes; so that while it catches every thing, it leaves off immense quantities of small-fry. The Methodist Church converts for all the other Churches; for, of the products of an ordinary Methodist revival, some go to the Presbyterian, some to the Baptist, and some to the Episcopalian and other Churches. And of those who unite with the Methodist Church, including all classes of temperaments, many subsequently leave it for others, because not constitutionally adapted to be Methodists. But, notwithstanding it supplies all other Churches, it still keeps itself larger than any of the rest, and increases at a faster rate.

So much for the Methodists, whose characteristics are passion and practical good sense, and whose polity and worship are the natural outgrowth of these. We shall speak next of the Episcopalians.

The Episcopalians, as we have said, are characterized by taste, elegance, and beauty; and in pursuing their peculiarities into the minutiae, we shall find them all radiating from an æsthetical center.

In the first place, the Episcopalians have fine churches, generally with tall, graceful spires, and elegant decorations, both external and internal. They do not build a church at all until they can build a good one; so that in every town you recognize an Episcopal church by its style and the fashionable locality in which it is placed. They have also fine music and fine forms of worship, with anthems, recitative, etc. They never commence worship in a new place until they can get a choir and trained responders; whereas the Methodists commence wherever they can get enough people together to take up a collection. The Episcopalian ministers are generally good readers, who, since their forms are all written, give their chief attention to saying them well. Even the people in the Episcopal Church have a graceful way of bowing, kneeling, and demeaning themselves generally. If an ancient Greek were to come suddenly among them, he would say that their worship is the worship of Venus, whereas the Methodists are worshippers of Mercury.

Again: the Episcopalians are strongly symbolical in their way of thinking, and are given to symbols in their rites and observances, it being the nature of art to symbolize truth. We see the cross on all

their Churches and in them. Their Churches are generally built in the shape of the cross, and are turned to the east, or placed with regard to some other significant points of the compass; as are also their dead, when buried. Every day of the year has a significance with them, as commemorative of some saint or event in Church history. Their Bible-readings, prayers, and general devotion and conduct are ordered according to Lent, Epiphany, Whitsuntide, or other days of ancient memories. Their dress, movements, and various positions during service, have also some significance. Their ceremonies, even, are thought to have a mystical power. Their baptism, as baptism, is supposed to carry conversion with it. Confirmation is supposed to constitute them, in a mystical sense, members of the Church. Ordination imparts a legitimacy to their ministry which makes them, to the exclusion of all others, the true successors of the apostles. The Sacrament of the Lord's-supper imports to them, if not the real body of Christ, at least something which can not be conveyed except by regularly ordained hands. In short, it is through these symbolical and ceremonial channels that they derive all the advantage from Christianity. It is about these things that they are chiefly occupied, both in their Church work and in their controversies. When religion is explained among them, it is largely an explanation of symbols. If the Episcopalians believed that Christ was baptized by immersion, they would all be Baptists, in the modern sense, in order to catch the form and whatever significance there might possibly be in it; whereas the Methodists, although they were all convinced that Christ and the apostles were dipped, would not adopt the same form of baptism, as being too cumbersome. All that now keeps the Episcopalians from immersion is, that it is untasteful and inelegant. They would, in imitation of Christ, wash each others' feet, but for the same reason; for they could not resist the example of Christ, or of an apostle, in any thing that has no practical utility in it. Even in their language, the Episcopalians have a regard to symbolical and formal significances. Their clergy are not preachers or ministers, like others, but rectors or priests. They call themselves Catholics, and never speak of the Roman Catholics without giving their full name. They scrupulously write the words, Church, and Bishop, and Sacrament, with capital initials; as also the pronouns, He, Him, etc., when standing for God or Christ.

In the next place, Episcopalians are peculiarly reverential, as reverence is a tasteful propriety in things religious. In their Churches there is no laughing and chatting, as in Methodist Churches. No sexton goes through the building lighting up the gas after the people have begun to assemble. No one is ever seen to open a window for ventilation, or to stir the fire. They would all suffocate, or freeze, first. No man puts on his overcoat while singing the Doxology; no lively tunes are played, no gay songs sung, in their service. In short, there are no improprieties. All are sanctimonious in all things pertaining to the church and its rites. If they want a gay time, they go to the theater or ball-room, and take another day and other surroundings for it. They make a strong distinction in regard to the proprieties of times and places in such actions. Herein they are the opposite of the Methodists, who think that their Church is not too good to do any thing good in, and that as for what is not good, it ought not to be done anywhere. Hence the Methodists, while they discountenance theaters, dancing, etc., altogether, as being injurious to them, would, if they practiced them at all, as soon do it in their churches as anywhere. The Episcopalians, who are so much attracted to such amusements, because of the element of grace in them, make their moral distinctions on the places where they do them, and not in their persons who do them; putting the sanctity in the churches, rites, Sabbaths, etc., and not, like the Methodists, in themselves. The Episcopalians adopt none of the ungodly modern improvements in their churches, such as office-rooms, parlors, kitchens, and other apparatus for business or sociables. They hold no concerts in their churches, no school or college anniversaries; they never give them up for political meetings or scientific lectures, but they cast such a sanctity about them that almost unfits them for use.

In the next place, the Episcopalians are strongly traditional, it being of the nature of taste to determine the beautiful and the appropriate by precedents of history and custom. They are largely given up to the study and admiration of antiquity, as also to its imitation. For their faith, and the reason of their practice, they depend on the Church fathers, saints, and usages of the Church, taking every thing on authority. They profess to be a continuation of the ancient Church, and think their ministry have inherited, in unbroken succession, from the apostles. They profess never to have changed from the begin-

ning, but to have taken each step only as they had precedent in Church history. Herein they are the opposite of the Methodists, who would not hesitate to improve on Christ himself. Their service is the service of the ancient Church as nearly as they can get at it. Their Church government is the government of the ancient Church, as they think. Their church-buildings are in the ancient ecclesiastical style. They do not consider how any of these are adapted to the wants of the present age; but even now they go to Rome to study the ancient churches, and if they find that they had porches in ancient times, they will put on porches now.

In the next place, the Episcopalians are eminently Scriptural; not so much because they like to go to the original sources, like the Presbyterians, but because of the element of antiquity and authority about them. They generally commence their sermons with long introductions, in which they relate, almost verbally, some portion of Scripture. Their whole subjects, moreover, as well as their texts, are taken from Scripture; and they rarely ever get away from the Biblical account in treating of them. They generally preach about Judea and the surrounding nations, and keep the people always back in those distant ages and countries. An average Episcopalian knows more about the geography of Palestine than of the United States or modern Europe, except England. They think it very inappropriate to speak of the political affairs of our own times, but dwell on those mentioned in the Bible. A High Churchman recently wrote: "I have heard a clergyman even dare to use the word Russia in the pulpit." In setting forth their thought, they largely use Scriptural terms, and Scriptural quotations, which makes their sermons appear any thing but original or suggestive to the people. When we consider that the service of the Episcopal Church is largely taken up with long Scriptural lessons, Epistles, and Gospel extracts for the day, rehearsals of the Psalms, chants of other portions of Scripture, and repetitions of other portions still, as the Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer, the use of so much Scripture and Scriptural distinctions in the sermon yet, is very unfortunate.

Again: the Episcopalians are the most sectarian of all Churches, owing to the clannish exclusiveness that characterizes folks of taste and fashion, who can enforce their social pretensions only as they are recognized to be, in some sense, superior to other people. They

think that theirs is the only true Church, and that they are the only true Christians. They call themselves *the Church*, and others mere "sects," or "persuasions," who have a chance of being saved, perhaps, but only as the heathen. Their ministers do not exchange with those of other denominations; and Episcopalians, all, make it a point not to go to other Churches. They think that they have the exclusive right to religion, and are very sore over the existence of other bodies. They proselyte constantly, and their universal dream is, that all other denominations will, one day, be merged in theirs. You can not talk ten minutes with an Episcopalian but he will tell you something about his Church, and try to convert you.

In the next place, the Episcopalians have no aggressive power, as might be expected of a Church whose characteristic is the predominance of a faculty which appeals, only in a quiet way, to a few, and those the more refined and wealthy circles; whereas the Methodists, who move by the motive power of humanity, have alone nearly all the aggressive force of Christianity. The Episcopalians recruit, almost entirely, from the children of believers and from proselytes, saving, of course, all their own children to the Church, and catching as many converts as they can from the Methodists and other sects. The Episcopalian can, accordingly, never expect to become a great Church, because it is not until men get considerable social and æsthetical culture that they are apt to be attracted by the elegance of Episcopalianism; but by that time they get, in this country, an intellectual culture which inclines them rather to Unitarianism, Congregationalism, or any thing else than Episcopalianism.

In politics, the Episcopalians are Democrats. During the war, they were rebels or copperheads; and in all times they are conservative, holding to that which is old and traditional, as against new innovations and radical changes. They profess to be anti-political; but therein they are only like all other men, who dislike mixing politics and religion. They know that they are on the unpopular side, and that they have a kind of politics that does not mix well with religion. Prior to the war, they were large slave-owners; and immediately on the close of the war, their Church was the first to unite, the North making all the concessions. The Methodists who left their Church during the war, generally joined the Episcopal Church. The Episcopalians think more of the Church than of the country, and

would let the country break rather than the Church. In the event of a war between the United States and England, the Episcopalians would most likely side, or at least sympathize, with England, because of the Church of England. They would prefer an aristocracy in this country to a republic, and the union of Church and State, provided the Episcopal could be the Established Church; for I have yet to see the first American Episcopalian who is in favor of the disestablishment of the Church in England, or even of the secularizing of the schools there.

So much for the Episcopalians, whose character and practices are, on the whole, a consistent development of our fine-art sentiment.

We come next to the Presbyterians. The characteristic of these, as we have said, is reason. As their peculiarities, however, are psychological rather than practical, we shall here indicate them only in a general way, and, since this may be somewhat uninteresting, only but briefly. They always follow consequences to their legitimate conclusion, without any intuitional breaks or common-sense looks between the steps, to see if the inferences are probable or sensible. Having taken their premises (mostly from Scripture), they deduce, without fear, all that will follow, whether it be the damnation of infants, the eternal punishment of irresponsible men, or the making of God the author of sin. They do not look even to see if their conclusions are contradictory, provided their process be logical; for they believe both in predestination and free will, necessity and God, the justice of God and his punishing men for committing his own predestinated sins, the benevolence of God and his good pleasure in hell torments, God's omnipotence and his inability to get along without evil, his foreknowledge and his inability to foresee contingent events, etc. The Presbyterians think it is not their part to examine the premises or the conclusions, but, getting the premises from God, to accept the conclusions as implied. They satisfy themselves by saying that God reconciles the contradictions, and that we, inasmuch as we do not know his whys and ways, must accept them on faith. While, therefore, the more intellectual, but less logical, Unitarians would stop to re-examine the premises, or else reject the conclusions because self-contradictory, and while the Methodists would reject them because conflicting with common sense or common benevolence, the Presbyterians, who never apply common sense to the Word

of God or to the stern process of logic, hold their conclusions, like the Kantian philosophers, as truths between two contradictions. Accordingly, while the Unitarians and the Methodists have a more rational and more sensible creed, the Presbyterians have a more consequential one.

In the next place, the Presbyterians, from not being intuitional, as logical characters or nations rarely are, lack all adaptation for original suggestion or investigation, whether in religion or science. They adopt no new ideas or practices, except as coming out of the old; they are progressive, but not radical; they build up, but do not tear down for it; they hold on to the old foundation, even if rotten. They are the only Church that never gives up any thing essential in doctrine or polity for the new revelations of science or history. But while they accept these latter, as far as they must, they try to harmonize them with their past creed, revising them for this purpose. They are, therefore, the critics of science and of radical reforms, lopping off and correcting before adopting them, but, at all events, still holding to their logical forms of faith and expression.

Again: the Presbyterians are consequential in their practice, as well as in their faith. They have elaborated their somber theology into an ascetic morality. Hence their Puritanism, their professed opposition to pleasure, gayety, and levity; their excessive plainness in person, home and Church service; their rigid Sabbath observance, etc. Being the historical antithesis of the Episcopalians in these respects, they have, with remarkable consistency, made themselves as much unlike them as possible. While the Episcopalians have always sought for the beauty and the pleasure in religion, the Presbyterians have sought for the truth. Accordingly, while the Episcopalians have been gay, dressy, cavalier-like, built fine churches, introduced beautiful motions, music, etc., because it is according to good taste, the Presbyterians have taken on all the rigid asceticism mentioned above, because it is a consequence of the teachings of Scripture which insist on giving up the world and its pomps and vanities.

Again: the Presbyterians are remarkable for what phrenologists call *continuity*—a quality that might be expected from their logicalness, as being necessary to pursue their trains of reasoning. They make proverbially long prayers, and preach long sermons, the latter being doctrinal and essay-like, instead of sententious like the Unitarians.

rians, practical like the Methodists, or Scriptural like the Episcopalians. In morals, they are uniform and consistent; not spasmodically religious, like the Methodists, nor religious by days and Church seasons, like the Episcopalians. They are not apt to backslide, or to need conversion more than once. In fact, their constitutional tendency to perseverance has made them throw the doctrine of backsliding out of their theology.

So much for the Presbyterians. We come next to the Unitarians. The great characteristic of these is intuitional thought, herein being the intellectual opposite of the Presbyterians, whose characteristic is logical thought. The Unitarians give up all, even their faith and former opinions, to the view of the moment. They think intensely and freely, but only spasmodically. They are remarkable for fine single thoughts, such as dash upon the intense and *quasi*-inspired thinker; but they do not connect or harmonize or unify their thought. They have thoughts, but not a system of thought; opinions, but not a system of belief. They think to-day differently from what they thought yesterday, and think on one subject differently from what they think on another. They do not let the different parts of their knowledge interfere to contradict or curtail each other. They do not know what they think on one subject when they are engaged at another, and they do not care. When truth appears to be different, on different correlated subjects, they do not, like the Presbyterians, seek to harmonize it, but they reject what, at the time, occupies least their attention, or else hold it all but loosely. Their great characteristic is freedom in thought—freedom from the past, freedom from other truths, freedom from logic, freedom from consistency. The reason they are so free from theological contradictions and general inconsistencies is, that they do not attempt to know any thing as a whole. If they did, they would find that one part of our knowledge or opinions, say on one subject, is irreconcilable with another part, or with our opinion on a different subject. Accordingly, while Presbyterians learn to endure difficulties, and to harmonize irreconcilable facts or beliefs, the Unitarians, in order to hold all things rationally, hold every thing in doubt. If they could only fix on one point, they might get the nucleus of a system. But the Unitarians lack decision of character—a necessary failing in intuitional or sententious thinkers; whereas the Presbyterians, above all others,

are, with their everlasting continuity, remarkable for this trait. The Unitarians seem not to consider that, to build up any thing, one must sacrifice part of his materials, which, however great in single pieces, can not be gotten equally great in the whole. Owing to this love of individual freedom in action, as in thought, they can not form a Church polity. Like the French radicals, no two will agree, and so each must strike out for himself, with only the force of a single individual; whereas the Methodists build up a great organization in which they all can work—less free, indeed, as individuals, but more powerful as a whole. Accordingly, the Unitarians have no Church, just as they have no creed; no polity, just as they have no system of theology. They, accordingly, can be nothing else than Congregational in their Church government, just as they can be only negative and disjunctive in faith. Agreeing to disagree, they form no close connections, and pursue no general aim.

The Unitarians, from the lack of logical connection in their thoughts, are capable of, somehow, believing in religion while rejecting its truth. They seem to think that religion is true, not in the common-sense meaning of that term, but that there is an inferior article of truth according to which it may be; that truth does not judge by that narrow standard of fact, but has some respect for our sentiments and aspirations. Not being able to find out what things are true, they have long since ceased to hunt for truths, but gone to work to get a new kind of truth itself, in which any object of thought can be interpreted as true.

In the next place, the Unitarians are disposed to all manner of reforms. Having no logical consistency, they are radical, and break off from the past, and from other countries, and even from their former selves. Having no appreciation of the difficulties, or of the wide connections of a system, whether of religion or politics or philosophy, or of the experience and accumulated work and wisdom necessary to build up a practical system, they always favor something entirely new and of present conception. Their reforms, too, are generally secular, instead of religious, owing to their indefiniteness and weakness of faith. They always opposed slavery in its days of power, and now they oppose the remaining relics of social inequality. They are in favor of woman's rights, labor and prison reform, and of the abolition of capital punishment—not so much on account of

benevolence, much less of religion, but on account of their theoretical ideals. Believing that the future life is uncertain, they give all their concern to this life. Their ideal is, accordingly, not in another world, but in the future of this; their heaven being distant, not in space, but in time. They are, accordingly, given up to all manner of schemes for human perfectibility, and dream forever of advancement. They differ from the Methodists in that their reforms are distant and general, while those of the Methodists are immediate and individual. The Unitarians keep their ideal afar off—the goal to which mankind are approaching, but which they never reach; whereas the Methodists look little farther than their immediate work.

On the whole, the Unitarians are an elaborated example of an intuitive, philosophical, and impractical people, leading the van of civilization in the religious team, but not pulling nor carrying the least.

With regard to the other Churches not mentioned above, we may observe that they contain nothing but the elements of those we have mentioned; none of them, however, being, in such a signal way, the development of one idea or the elaboration of one characteristic. The Baptists are Methodists in their revivals and general religious earnestness and energy. They are Episcopalians in their sectarianism, close communion, and proselyting, in believing themselves to be the only true Church, and in adhering so strongly to form, as they do in baptism. They are Presbyterians in their strictness and uniformness of religious thought and conduct. The Congregationalists are Unitarians in their freedom of thought and of organization, Presbyterians in learning, and Methodists in secular practicalness. The Catholics are Episcopalians in ceremony, authority, reverence, exclusiveness, and proselytism, Methodists in practical energy, and Presbyterians (their priests) in learning. They combine, to a great extent, all the elements, and hence are such a large and powerful Church.

Comparing now, by way of summary, the several religions above mentioned, the Methodist Church has least learning, the Episcopalian least thought, the Presbyterian too much learning for independent thought, and the Unitarian too much independent thought for connected systems, whether of learning or of Church work. The Methodists are, accordingly, one extreme, and the Unitarians the other, of practicalness, it being all with the Methodists; and *vice versa* as to

thought, this being with the Unitarians. For while the Methodists have just enough thought and learning to be active, the Unitarians and Presbyterians have great, unwieldy stores of it, which they do not use. The Methodists, who know so well how to do, have not learned how to think without doing. They are spendthrifts of their powers, using their knowledge up so close as to turn it all into practical results.

Touching the grounds of religion, the Methodists accept Christianity without knowing any thing about it, the Episcopalians take it on authority, the Presbyterians on faith, and the Unitarians reject it. The Methodists, in this matter, are simply ignorant, the Episcopalians stupid, the Presbyterians prejudiced, and the Unitarians indifferent.

With regard to the constituencies of the Churches, the Methodist can be said to embrace the people generally—the working-men, negroes, politicians, traders, and practical men. The Episcopalian embraces the aristocracy, especially the cod-fish kind—the swells, fashionable folks, snobs, clerks, coquettes, fine ladies, wives of officers and public men (when their husbands are not religious), first families of Virginia, descendants of Pocahontas, and of old English (Norman) stock. The Presbyterian is the Church of professors, especially professors of the Greek and Latin classics, and of formal logic; the Unitarian the Church of physicists, chemists, geologists, metaphysicians, discoverers, etc. The Methodists are the heart, the Episcopalians the nerves, and the Unitarians the brains, of American religion. With regard to climatic distribution, the Methodist, like the dog, is of universal latitude, the Episcopalians are suited to the South, the Presbyterians to the Middle States, and the Unitarians to the North. And, finally, touching our historical relations, the Methodist is the present Church, the Episcopalians the past Church, the Unitarians the future Church. The Methodist is according to the age, the Episcopalians live in another age—a past age—the Unitarians expatiate in the perfectibility of the ideal future, the Presbyterians have one foot in the past and one in the present. The Methodist will always be the actual Church, the Unitarian the ideal one; although, with their genius for change, the Methodists will more likely become the Unitarian Church, than the Unitarians, with their denominational inefficiency, grow to embrace the whole.

II.—THE LIBERAL EDUCATION OF GIRLS.

THE narrowness and insufficiency of merely utilitarian ideas of education is perhaps nowhere more painfully apparent than in the present state of the intellectual culture of women. To the prevalence of these ideas is doubtless to be attributed both the general neglect with which our daughters have been treated as regards opportunities of advanced education, and the perversion of such opportunities as some of them have, or might have, enjoyed.

Young ladies were not expected to enter the learned professions; therefore no provision for advanced intellectual culture was supposed to be necessary or advisable for them. Showy and ornamental attainments were regarded as best adapted to promote their success in society; and hence a course of culture extremely superficial and unsubstantial was in general adopted for those whose education was to be carried beyond the common limits.

As a rule, no suitable opportunities for a high order of intellectual culture have ever been available for the young ladies of this country. Money could not procure for our daughters educational facilities at all comparable to those enjoyed by the better classes of our young men. The result is as was to be expected. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that we have no women among us who, without excess of courtesy, can be called thoroughly educated. The few exceptions to this statement will generally be found among the daughters or other near relatives of educated men, from whom, in their own homes, they have derived the inspiration and received the assistance necessary to the success of the educational effort.

It is but natural, therefore, that, having come at length to appreciate in some measure the importance of education, aside from its immediate practical or material results, to regard it as a means of ennobling and elevating the character—as that without which life must lack its highest and truest significance—we should be overtaken, as it were, with a sense of surprise and shame, in view of the neglect with which we have treated our daughters in reference to one of the highest interests of all human existence.

For these reasons, and for others which we trust will become apparent as we proceed, we believe that there is no subject which more imperatively demands the earnest and careful attention of educators, and of all thoughtful men, than that of the liberal or collegiate education of girls.

The most important of the rights of woman, that for want of which she has most suffered, is doubtless the right of education. The effect of a thorough and suitable culture upon the mind and character of the young man—correcting his tastes, quickening his apprehension, enlarging his mental capacity, and in every way adding to those faculties which are esteemed his most valuable endowments in every sphere of life, whether public, social, or domestic, is a fact well known and appreciated by all who have the opportunity of observation and comparison.

That a similar culture would be equally valuable for young ladies, there is not the least reason to doubt. But if we are to realize this most desirable result, we must take our position in advance of the hitherto prevalent utilitarian notions which would assign education to certain positions and professions as their especial prerogative, and accustom ourselves more and more to regard it as something which belongs to the man or the woman essentially and of right, and as of incalculable importance to either in whatever condition of life.

Recently, it is true, most praiseworthy efforts have been put forth, and considerable sums of money have been bestowed and expended, in the attempt to provide suitable facilities for the liberal education of young ladies. But the work is still in the stage of initiation and experiment. So lately have we begun to comprehend the importance of the subject, and to give it our practical attention, that the pecuniary resources at present available for the purpose are by no means adequate to meet the demands which become more and more pressing with the increasing intelligence and capacity of our people; and—what is equally significant of inability and inexperience—we have not as yet reached any clear and well-defined conception of the work required to be done. It is by no means a settled question what kind of higher education is best for young ladies, nor where and under what circumstances it is best for them to pursue it. Even when we have finished the controversy in reference to the comparative merits of different courses of study in the education of young men, we shall

have reached no conclusion which will be necessarily applicable in the case of young women. It by no means follows that what is best for one sex, as regards the subject-matter of the higher education, is best also for the other; nor that the usual freedom of American colleges, or the conventual strictness of the boarding-school system, is well adapted to the wants and circumstances of young ladies while making the effort of advanced intellectual culture. There are in either case fair grounds for a contrary presumption.

But there is another difficulty of a still more serious nature, which will properly claim precedence in our discussion over either of those above mentioned, as the considerations relating to it are more ultimate and vital. All culture is conditional upon the fact of a pre-existing vital efficiency, or capacity of growth. The question of natural vigor and strength must, therefore, precede that of the direction and training to be given to original endowments. And no theory of feminine education can have the slightest chance of success—unless it be the most flimsy and superficial—or should be regarded as worthy a moment's attention, which does not, even from the outset, take into the account the present universally enfeebled condition of the health of American women.

For our own part, we are convinced that no other consideration relating to our subject can compare with this in importance. It is a matter which has of late been frequently urged upon the attention of the public, and facts and statistics have been presented sufficient to justify the most serious apprehensions for the future. But we have scarcely need of reports and statistics. Enough will be apparent to every one who will take the trouble to observe the facts as they exist in his own immediate neighborhood. In addition to the universally feeble health of our women, above referred to, such observation will reveal the fact that there are generally but one, two, or three children in each American family—sometimes none at all, scarcely enough on the whole, allowing for those who are likely to die before maturity, to supply the places of their parents in numbers, not to say that the average vitality seems to diminish as the generations descend. There can be no use in shutting our eyes to these facts, or in attempting to evade their significance. In very large sections of our country, probably in great majorities of our whole population, the original Americo-European stock has already ceased to increase. The

progressive vigor of the race seems already broken, and there remains, as it were, only a lingering tenacity of existence, a more and more feeble resistance of the vital forces against destructive influences, which are constantly and rapidly increasing. We have, indeed, the best reason to fear that, as a race, we are well past the half-way mark on the road to extermination. Fifty years more like the last fifty, less than fifty like the last twenty, and in large sections of our country we shall be physically degenerate beyond the possibility of redemption; nay, many, perhaps the majority, of our American homes with their years of accumulated improvement and adornment, the evidences of our culture and industry and skill, will be already in the hands of the descendants of strangers.*

The contest of physical life between races in this country, assuredly involves consequences of the most serious import, not only to ourselves and our children, but also to the whole course of our future civilization. Questions of the gravest importance depend upon its issue for their ultimate decision. In this contest, we are unquestionably at a most decided disadvantage. There may, indeed, be a question how far the influences fatal to our progressive vitality as a race have already proceeded; there can be none as to their existence and progress. And we think that no one who will take the trouble to compare the physical status of American women of the present day with that of any other race or class existing among us, who will compare the number of children in the families of the respective classes, and consider also what proportion of American girls are strong and healthy, in such a degree as to give them reasonable assurance of success in their expected encounter with the trials and burdens of life, will incline to accuse us of exaggerating the facts, or of overestimating their importance.

To the intelligent and thoughtful observer there is, indeed, no sadder subject of contemplation than the probable future of American

* We are aware that many are inclined to account for the fact that our native population does not increase, on grounds which would imply a terribly perverted moral sense on the part of those who should be parents. There is doubtless some basis of truth in the explanation thus suggested, though by no means enough, we may be sure, to account for the existing facts. Indeed, it is not difficult to see how a greatly exaggerated impression in reference to the evil alluded to might easily prevail.

If there really exists a moral malady of the extent and character alleged, that feature of the case, though more hopeless and discouraging than that of mere physical infirmity, is doubtless to be referred to the same ultimate causes, and the two must be regarded as to a considerable extent interdependent.

girls, confessedly the brightest and fairest that any age or generation ever produced, the charm of our social life, the pride and ornament of our prosperous civilization, but destined, unless we shall in some way be able to turn back the tide of destructive influences, which we have hitherto been unable to check, to be swept, as it were, from the stage of positive and profitable existence, to cease from all influence or connection with the future destinies of the race. The question for American women is, indeed, no longer one of choices of spheres or courses of education, to be selected by fancy or caprice; it is rather a question of continued existence, whether they and their daughters shall be able to hold their places as the wives and mothers of the future American people, or whether they are to be superseded and displaced from their present honorable position by the ruder and hardier stock which a later emigration supplies. And this important question is not to be decided according to the fancy either of women or men. It is a question of vitality merely, and depends especially upon those influences which shall determine the physical vigor of our women.

The considerations suggested by the facts above indicated can not but have the gravest significance in their bearing upon the subject of our discussion. For if we are hardy enough—as men frequently are—to disregard the almost certain indications of future disaster; we shall find that even our present possibilities, in the practical work of education, are most seriously circumscribed by the force of the circumstances above stated.

In this view of the case, however, we would not, of course, be understood to assert that girlhood, in this country, is in a condition of positive disease and suffering, but rather that it manifests but a feeble development of the vigor and animation which is due to youthful life. It is not so much actual disease as the absence of substantial and reliable health that we have to complain of—a physical frailty which renders the young girl incapable of making, without danger of serious consequences, any earnest, positive effort for the attainment of advanced education; a weakness increasing with the growth, and generally resulting in actual disease and suffering at a later period of life.

It is easy to see that a condition under which the life is thus blighted, and deprived of the strength which is natural to it and necessary to its substantial success, amounts to a positive prohibi-

tion of vigorous effort for the attainment of advanced education, if not to an actual incapacity for it.

This condition is, we believe, the rule among the better classes of girls and young ladies in this country. It is at least certain that the healthful vitality and the elastic vigor which all girls ought to possess, and which the girls of other nations do, in great measure, possess, is increasingly rare among ours.

Yet we can not sympathize with those who, for the reasons above stated, would discourage all efforts on the part of our girls toward the attainment of liberal education. But, in treating of the general subject, it certainly becomes our first duty, in view both of present limitations and future disastrous possibilities, to inquire into the nature and cause of a difficulty so wide-spread and significant, and, if possible, to indicate the means by which it may be overcome or avoided. To this duty, therefore, we propose to attend at once, and as briefly as the nature of the case will permit.

It is evident, we remark first, that the decaying health of our women is not due to physical or organic causes, which, in the order of nature and Providence, are beyond our control, but to causes which are essentially artificial and human. It can not be attributed to any inherent weakness of original stock, nor to unfavorable conditions of country or climate; for the stock from which we are descended was hardy and vigorous, and the country and climate in which it has developed is known to be healthful. The difficulty must, therefore, belong to the process of our growth and development as a people; in other words, it is a product of our peculiar civilization. It may be said, in familiar terms, that our women are "breaking down" under the influence of the civilization we have produced for them, or forced upon them. Or, since our civilization, proceeding from the same fundamental ideas, is essentially unity—the same for both sexes, though they may stand differently related to it—we may say that, as a race, we are unable to bear the civilization we have produced, and the destructive influence evolved has naturally attacked the point which was at once the weakest and most vital—the health of our women.

Again: it is evident that this destructive influence can not proceed from any element of our civilization which is essential to true human culture. It is only a false civilization which can produce such a result. There can, indeed, be no better evidence that any element

of culture or civilization is false, than that it is enfeebling and destructive to those it was designed to improve.

In what, then, does the destructive force incident to our civilization consist? It surely can not be owing to any lack of provision for material comforts. Our civilization is not surpassed in this respect by any other that ever existed; and the present generation of Americans are better housed, clothed, and fed than any previous generation has ever been. Nor can we believe that our civilization is unhealthy because of the activity, intelligence, or refinement by which it is characterized. These are unquestionably legitimate elements of a true human culture, and can not, therefore, be incompatible with a substantial physical vigor. Nor can the feebleness of our women be justly attributed to certain modes of dress and habits of life, which are commonly accused as the causes, but which are in reality effects rather than causes, and are to be regarded as indications of the nature and tendency of our civilization, rather than as exerting any important influence upon it. These habits may indeed be, to some extent, the means through which the real cause acts; but the cause itself they certainly are not. And we may remark, in passing, that all attempts to remedy the difficulty by merely seeking to correct these habits, will be as unproductive of substantial benefit in the future as they have been in the past. The real cause of a disorder so deep-seated and universal can not itself be of a superficial or casual nature. It exists, not in circumstances, but in ideas; not in accident, but in purpose: it is to be sought for, not on the surface of the current of life, but far down in its original sources. It is doubtless to the *morale* of our civilization, to its general aim and tendency, that we must look for the true solution of the difficulty.

The cause of our trouble, if we apprehend it correctly, may be traced to the prevalence of radically false ideas, which enter into our estimate of life, and lead to a misapprehension of its true purpose and advantage; false views prevailing so generally that their prevalence conceals their falsity, mingling with all our courses of activity and thought, and so far perverting the general tendencies of our civilization as to disturb the natural, healthful balance of the vital forces through which the perverting influence is expressed.

A certain conformity to the natural course and the true purpose of life is doubtless necessary to the healthful development of the

vital force itself. The wants of civilized existence, and the necessary labor of supplying them, are, in general, calculated to secure such a conformity, or, at least, to operate as a check upon any too wide or too rapid divergence. But with accumulated wealth and enlarged capacity of production comes an increased liberty of life, accompanied, however, by increased responsibility, and, probably, also by an increased susceptibility to injurious influences to enforce it. Men have therefore, in no case, an unrestricted liberty to make life subserve purposes different from that which it was designed to fulfill; and if, through a constantly perverted mental aim and tendency, it is turned from its legitimate purpose and direction, it will be found, also, to be separated from the essential sources of its strength. Now, it happens that this increased liberty of life—a liberty far greater than the people of any other age or country have ever attained—in our society, falls chiefly to the lot of our women. Our women, in far greater numbers than our men, are exempt from the necessary labor of life, and have far greater liberty to indulge the tendencies which prevail. Indeed, the position of woman in any country may be said to indicate the degree and character of its civilization; and it has been remarked, with fully as much truth as satire, that the progress of all races for five thousand years is represented by the difference between a wigwam and a lady's parlor. Woman, then, is the truest representative of our civilization. Being most exposed to its prevailing tendencies, she becomes a test of the truth or falsity of its ideal. Not only its excellences, but also its defects, will be most apparent in her.

In the application of these principles to the physical condition of woman, it would not be difficult to show that the development of the vital force is, to a great extent, conditioned and determined by the prevailing ideal itself, through the subtle influences of thought and imagination and purpose. We shall, however, proceed first to the consideration of influences which, if not more real and efficient, are at least more immediate and tangible. We allege that through the influence of dominant, almost universal, and irresistible tendencies which characterize our civilization, the life of woman in our society is almost of necessity turned from its natural, legitimate, healthful course. We have, however, no space in this paper to discuss the question of woman's sphere. Nor do we believe such discussion to

be needful. We have observed that the indications of the Inspired Book often lead, as it were, by a short cut to the conclusions of philosophy, and we doubt not it will prove so in this case. We shall therefore take it for granted that when God said, "*It is not good that man should be alone, I will make a helpmeet for him*" that is suited to his needs, he indicated the chief ends of woman's existence. Woman, therefore, is to supply a companionship to man, such as he could not find in other men, and to be a helper suited to his needs—such a helper as one man could not be to another. We observe, also, that the first of these functions seems to be fulfilled in the second: the companion is supplied in the helper; the companionship depends on the help; and surely a helpless, feeble, burdensome woman can not be a companion to man in the sense in which a healthful, helpful woman could be.

We observe, further, that the woman is joined to an individual man as his wife. Woman, therefore, is the helper of man in a private, not in a public, capacity. It appears, therefore, that home is pre-eminently the sphere of woman, and helpfulness to man the general purpose of her life. Here, too, is what every man needs. Such a companion and helper will double his capacity for his proper work in life, and give him a happiness and peace which nothing else on earth can supply; and the advantages are, of course, in every respect, reciprocal. We will venture that philosophy, after years of discussion and experiment, will give us no better solution of the "woman question" than that which we thus derive from these brief indications of the Inspired Word.

But let us here pause for a moment to consider how far the prevailing ideal of woman's life in American society corresponds to these purposes of the Almighty. Is it the chief aim of woman in our society to be the helper of man? Is it a principal purpose of her education—such as she receives—to fit her to be such a helper as well as companion? Does she begin by acquiring habits of helpfulness in her father's household? Do the chief aims and ambitions of her life center in the idea of home, or is the prevailing tendency of our society and civilization such as to pervert her ideas and efforts in these respects from the very outset? Does she, in reality, expect to help, or to be helped; to serve, or to be served? Is she content with the truth of man's love, the intimacy of his confidence, the care

with which he protects her and supplies her wants, while she, on her part, faithfully endeavors to minister to his necessities, to add to his strength, and thus to aid him in the legitimate purposes of his life? or does she expect, rather, to be the index of his worldly success, the object of his devotion, upon which he may lavish, endlessly, the results of his accumulations and labors, and by the attendance of servants, to be raised, as far as possible, above the necessary care and labor of life? In a word, is she, does she aspire to be, the stay, the comfort, the guardian genius and ministering angel of home? or does she desire, rather, to shine in society, and to be expensively dressed and chivalrously attended for that purpose? Is she in reality the helper that God intended she should be? Does man recognize her in this character, and seek her for her helpfulness? or is he as often obliged to avoid her as a burden too heavy for him to bear?

Let it be understood that, in asking or answering these questions, we have no word of blame for woman. She is in this regard but an index of the prevailing social tendencies, which are ultimately determined by man. The ideal at which she aims is that which he has suggested to her, and encouraged her to pursue. It is his idea of life which she accepts and reflects. Her relation to man is such that she correctly represents the prevailing moral sentiments and social tendencies which he originates and fashions. She is only more exposed, from her position in society, to the influences which prevail; and the extreme susceptibility of her nature renders her peculiarly obnoxious to the results which ensue.

But let us now consider what must be the inevitable effect of the changes or perversions above indicated. Woman is doubtless adapted, by her peculiar natural endowments, to the peculiar element in which she was designed to live. If home is pre-eminently the sphere of woman, then the atmosphere of home is that in which she will best thrive. If helpfulness to man is a principal object of her life, then the field of domestic activity is that which is best adapted for the healthful development of her powers. We may not presume that she is equally adapted to another sphere of life, or to another field of effort. On the contrary, the fineness of fiber and the delicate susceptibility of nerve on which the charm of her womanhood depends, which are essential to its highest functions and to the best fulfillment of the various duties and relations of domestic life,

actually unfit her for contact with the rough and busy world. The toil and care of public industrial life, severe or long-continued mental exertion, or the burden and tension of social imposition and exaction, she will find irritating, exhausting, and enfeebling. Her peculiar organization requires for its healthful development, both the quiet and the unconventional freedom of home, and the gentle activity of daily domestic duty. The latter is especially important, being to woman, as it were, the balance-wheel of the machinery of life, serving as a reservoir of strength, imparting steadiness of nerve, and promoting the harmonious development of the physical frame.

We repeat that the quiet and natural freedom of home, as distinguished from the excitement of public life and the restlessness and restraint of society, and the daily practice of domestic industry, as distinguished from severer labor or listless idleness, are both essential to the well-being of a highly developed womanhood. Yet neither is allowed to the developing womanhood of the present generation of Americans.

For the misguided ambition which leads certain classes of women to seek masculine occupations when the most pressing want of the whole land is domestic assistance, and the unbecoming clamors of others for political rights, finds its fitting counterpart in another class far more numerous, and whose error is at least equally serious; who, forsaking, like the first, the genial atmosphere and the proper duties of home, live chiefly *in*, or at least *for*, *society*, and so rear their daughters that *society, and not home*, is the end of their aspirations and efforts, and the chief staple of their daily thoughts; who, in fact, bring the style, the burdens, the conventionalities, the restraints and exactions of society as disturbing and unhallowed influences into the sanctuary of home itself.

We would not, however, be understood to infer that woman has no place in society, of which, in fact, she is, and must be, the real life and charm. But both the aims of society and its relation to the home life of the people should be different from those which at present prevail. Society should not be the theater of conventional ceremony, of rivalry and extravagance and display. It should rather be simple and free, as the natural outgoing and overflow of the popular life for relaxation and enjoyment, as well as for refinement and improvement. It should receive tone and character from the daily common life which

supports it, and should not be allowed to impose its laws or inflict its burdens on the latter. In a word, it should be the servant and assistant of our civilization, rather than its arbiter and tyrant. But, not content with the perversion of its own proper sphere, it has invaded the circle of home; and, with its pretentious ceremonial, its artificial restraints and conventional exactions, it has effectually suppressed the freedom and opportunity of domestic life, and forbidden the discharge of its essential duties. It is indeed plain, as well from the nature of the difficulties with which our women are afflicted as from the influences which we see manifestly at work, that *want of freedom and simplicity*—those conditions of our social and domestic life which induce *a constant excitement and uneasiness of mind*; or, in other words, the burdens and restraints of social imposition and exaction—are among the most prominent causes of the evils we have to deplore. These burdens and exactions fall heaviest upon woman where, from the peculiarities of the feminine constitution, she is least able to bear burdens—her mental and nervous organization. When, therefore, in addition to the unceasing, ever-increasing impositions of society in the matter of dress, and the endless amount of wearisome, unwholesome labor required to produce it, we consider also the restraints and exactions of etiquette and of what are esteemed the proprieties of rank and of genteel deportment, and the inevitable mental unrest with which, by these means, even the home-life of the young girl is harassed, together with the enforced repudiation of wholesome domestic employment, it will appear but too plainly that if home, with its undisturbed quiet and essential freedom, and its daily routine of domestic duties, is the proper sphere and employment of woman, she will not be likely to thrive under the present conditions of our social and domestic life. Nor should we overlook the moral effect of a course by which our girls are led to turn almost with loathing from the desire and practice of that which should constitute the substance and staple of their lives. For it is surely beyond reasonable doubt that vastly too much of a stimulating, disturbing, unpractical ideal, and vastly too little of steady substance and reality, enters into the lives of our girls at the period of development of both body and mind, the time when such perversions are most seriously and permanently detrimental. Women who were reared and acquired their strength when the course of life among us was less artificial,

generally, indeed, seem able to endure in a manner under the present system; but that a healthy, vigorous womanhood can never be developed under present conditions, the evidences are only too painfully and universally apparent.

In regard to the means to be adopted to counteract the degenerating and enfeebling influences above explained, experience has shown that no dependence can be placed upon the artificial devices so commonly prescribed. Walking, riding, calisthenic or gymnastic exercises, are doubtless well enough in their places, but they can not answer the exigencies of the case now upon us; nor could they, if persevered in far more faithfully than they ever have been, or are ever likely to be. No series of special, spasmodic efforts can restore the natural conditions of health to unnatural lives, least of all for our girls. The danger of the situation is both serious and imminent, and we can no longer afford to trifle in the use of such paltry, temporizing expedients.

On the contrary, it is of the most vital and pressing importance that our social and domestic systems should, if possible, be so arranged that not an exceptional hour or two per day, but *the whole course of the daily lives of our girls should be natural and healthy, unconsciously and spontaneously so*. Unless this shall in some way be done, we can not reasonably expect, under present circumstances, to secure for them the natural vigor of healthy constitutions, nor even to arrest the downward tendency which thus far we seem to have resisted in vain.

In order, therefore, that we may the better understand the grounds upon which such rearrangement should proceed, let us briefly recur to some of the fundamental principles which underlie human life and condition its development, among which the first and most universal is the great law of the natural necessity of labor.

The fact may be well understood, but it seems nevertheless to be universally overlooked and forgotten, that all human life must be supported by labor—that a burden of labor is entailed upon every individual existence.

Now, in the natural order of things, it belongs to each one to bear this burden, or to learn to bear it, for himself; and no one can contrive to retire from it, or cast it upon others, without meanness in the attempt, and weakness in the result. The indulgence of parents and

the laws of inheritance can, indeed, remove the pressure of necessity, and perhaps modify the rule of propriety; but with the natural consequences of conformity or non-conformity to the law itself, they can in no wise interfere. He that helps himself and others will be strong; he that depends unduly upon the assistance of others will be weak.

There can therefore be no greater mistake than to estimate the importance of labor by its material products alone. The obligation to labor was imposed on man under circumstances which seem to indicate that moral rather than material advantage was its ultimate object; and in actual experience we find that it is no less salutary in its effects on his moral and intellectual nature than necessary to supply him with the means of comfortable subsistence. The truth of this view becomes especially apparent when we consider the case in its application to the conditions of youth. Here, indeed, the material products of labor are generally of little account, while its importance as a means of practical, moral, and educational discipline can scarcely be overestimated. It imparts a substantial vigor to the youthful body and mind, and healthy tone to the morals, which can, in general, be derived from no other source; and it is especially from the habit of physical industry that that force and substance of character and energy of purpose is most likely to be developed which renders its subject capable of successful effort for the education of the mind.

The material products of labor may be purchased with money. Its moral and disciplinary results can be secured only through an actual experience of the labor itself, with its proper responsibilities and cares. It therefore by no means follows, because parents are wealthy, that their children should be deprived of this invaluable means of discipline and strength; for no artificial condition or influence can adequately replace the great fundamental law of natural necessity in its effect on the developing life. And the man who brings up his children without giving them to see the necessity of labor in its relation to the wants of every individual existence, and accustoming them to the cheerful performance of their proper share of it, deprives them of their best possible opportunity for the development of their various natural capacities.

Woman is intimately associated with man in all the cares and necessities of his earthly state. She is properly and primarily *his helper* as well as companion, and a practical recognition of the law of

labor, in her case, also, must lie at the foundation of a true education and a successful life. Her proper duties in this regard are indeed less arduous than those of man, but they are not less real, while they are even more uniform and constant; for, whether the man's proper industry is in the way of manual toil or professional skill, the daily needs of his life are still the same, and must still be supplied by the same economy of household service and care. The way of woman's helpfulness is therefore always obvious; and a just conception of the case would lead her to regard every kind of useful domestic industry as honorable, and to discover meanness only in the disposition to retire from it and leave the proper burden of her life to be borne by others. It would tend especially to correct that fastidious selfishness which leads so many of our girls to reject all kinds of employment, except those which are esteemed the most refined and genteel—nearest, in fact, to no labor at all, and which have reference to purposes of ornament and display rather than to the common necessities of comfortable existence. Surely, those employments which are the most necessary and useful, should also be esteemed the most respectable; and they are, in general, the best adapted to counteract the false delicacy, pride of class, and fastidiousness which constitute a chief bane of woman's existence, and a principal source of her weakness. They tend also to develop in the character resolution and energy, graced by patience and modesty, the cheerfulness of conscious capacity with dispositions of helpfulness, and impart the charm of a genuine heroism to common life and its duties.

This truth is most aptly presented by the German novelist, Paul Heyse, in a single significant remark which he applies to one of his heroines when reduced to humble circumstances in life: "*In aller niederen Arbeit trat der Adel ihres Wesens nur lebendiger hervor*" (*In every lowly occupation the true nobleness of her nature became only the more beautifully apparent*).^{*} So indeed it might always be. The useful and necessary industries of the household need never obscure, but if performed in a proper spirit will always develop and present

^{*} So also in Fairfax's translation of "Jerusalem Delivered:"

"Not those rude garments could obscure and hide
The heavenly beauty of her angel face;
Nor was her princely off-spring [origin] damnified,
Or aught disparaged by those labors base."

in a fairer light, the true excellence of the character, and the real beauty of the life.

But how different in this respect is the ideal of life which prevails in American society, where labor, aside from its material results, enters into the estimate only so far as we are unable to exclude it! The more of enjoyment the life comprises, and the less that is disagreeable and laborious, the more fortunate and successful we esteem it. We make little account of life as a stage of discipline for the development of noble characters, beautiful for simplicity and strong in devotion to duty and truth; nor of the happiness which results from labors bravely accomplished and duties faithfully discharged. We would find as much as possible of our heaven on this earth, as though we were already fitted to enjoy it, and seek our enjoyment mainly from the material sources whose temptations are spread out in such deceitful profusion before the eyes of our prosperous people.

Especially do the prevailing tendencies of the times suggest to the mind of the young girl who moves in the better circles of American society an ideal of life which is all sunshine and pleasure. She thinks of no burdens to be borne, no disagreeable industrial duties to be performed. Her friends are to provide for her and make her happy, and she would as soon think of going through life without her hands as of dispensing with the assistance of servants. Her pathway is to be strewn with flowers, she is to love and be loved, and will graciously dispense to others the charm and sunshine of her life. In general, her mere society will be sufficient for that. The extravagant fancies of the age of chivalry are again applied to her. Her breath is fragrance, her glance is inspiration, her heart is gentleness and affection. Of course, nothing so vulgar and disagreeable as real work is to be thought of for such a creature; only gentle ministries, to be performed or not, according to her pleasure; soft and beautiful raiment, luxuries and delicacies, attention and devotion.

It is well that these fancies can but seldom be realized; it is ill that they are so far indulged by the youthful imagination and hope as to cheat the life of much of the real worth and happiness it might otherwise possess.

But the representation above given is at least no caricature of the ideal of life which is entertained by and for the better classes of American girls, for whom especially we propose the advantages of

liberal education ; and the ideal entertained in these classes has also a powerful influence upon the efforts and aspirations of those who occupy humbler positions.

Now, it is mainly through the operation of these fundamental ideas that the strength or weakness of the developing life is determined. The ideal which we have just contemplated can not be otherwise than enervating and enfeebling. It is destitute of every principle which could impart strength to the body, vigor to the intellect, or health and firmness to the character. In the view of life it presents, there can be no need of force, or of any capacity of achievement or effort, and no influence to call it forth. On the contrary, such an ideal, if allowed its proper influence, most effectually breaks the connection between the life-force within and those external influences which are necessary to its successful development ; and the vital energies failing thus to be drawn out into their natural courses, are left to produce an abnormal, ill-balanced, partial, or precocious development of the functions of life, resulting inevitably in feebleness and blight.

Such is the inevitable force of wrong ideas, of false estimates of life, in determining the physical condition of a people which entertains them. There is indeed no occasion for surprise that girls of the class referred to are frail in health and lack capacity for educational effort. It is surprising, rather, that sensible men should have so inadequate an apprehension of the nature of the difficulty as to expect to counteract its effects by advising the class thus affected to "take more exercise," wear stouter shoes and looser dresses, play croquet, ride horseback, skate, and practice calisthenics, as if these flimsy and artificial human devices could ever replace the great provisions of natural necessity which God himself has chosen to ordain as the conditions of successful life.

But let it be further observed that young girls in the better circles of American society are not only encouraged to indulge the false ideal above sketched, but it is in reality almost forced upon them ; and they, far more than any other class of our population, are in a condition to pursue it in their lives. They are not only exempt from the necessity of useful labor, but they are also, to a great extent, actually excluded from the opportunity of it.

For repudiating the principles of republican equality and inde-

pendence in our social life, casting behind us the frugality and the virtuous simplicity of our ancestors, and affecting the quality and imitating the customs of the old-world aristocracies, we have committed almost the whole domain of house-labor, which, in a vast majority of instances, constitutes the only suitable sphere of woman's industrial activity, to the hands of a class of servants, or at least of persons whom we love to consider as servants, though it must be admitted that their demeanor is often such as might indicate a different relation. By this means our girls are not only deprived of their only suitable opportunity of active and useful industry, but the labor itself is degraded in their eyes. They learn to regard it as disreputable for themselves or any respectable persons, and fit only for a race of menials. Girls who grow up in families where the domestic labor, except some select portions, is performed by servants, feel that they must always have servants, as a matter of course. They learn to regard themselves as standing somehow above the common lot of humanity, and would esteem it a degradation and a hardship to be obliged to bear any considerable portion of the burden of their own existence.

We can not but regard the system of domestic service which at present exists among us, as one of the greatest banes of American civilization. It is, in fact, the great foundation upon which, more than any thing else, the false tendencies of the times, and whatever is false in our ideal of life, is based. And if we were called upon to give in brief the best possible prescription for the ills of American women, we should say at once, and in all confidence, *dismiss your servants*. We believe that these three words contain more practical wisdom in reference to this subject than can be expressed in as many pages which shall not include the same idea. It is true that all rules have their exceptions, and discriminations would, of course, be necessary in the application of this. And we may say in general that assistance in labor among equals, or on terms of familiar equality, would be not only unobjectionable, but in many cases indispensable.

But if any necessity should arise under which our present system of domestic service should be completely overturned and abolished, we confidently believe that a dozen years would show beneficial results sufficient to compensate an hundred-fold the inconveniences and disadvantages which such an event might at first occasion. Our women would then, of necessity, be withdrawn from their present

frivolous, enervating, belittling employments, to engage in the useful and honorable duties of domestic life. We should indeed be obliged to forego, to a considerable extent, the pretense and display, the affectation of style and quality now so highly prized and so eagerly sought, and return to a manner of life simpler, indeed, but truer and nobler, and infinitely better adapted to the development of all that is highest and most excellent in our nature.

For our own part, we have little confidence that any plan for the physical restoration of American women can ever be successful which does not include some certain and sufficient provision for the redemption of domestic industry from its present state of servile degradation; and we should have more hope for the future of American society from an organization of honorable and intelligent American women, who should resolve and pledge each other to be independent in their own houses, to do their own work with the assistance only of their own family and friends, or, at least, to receive no assistance from servants as such, than from any other movement which it is possible for our times to inaugurate. We sincerely believe that a change in the conditions of household labor and service in accordance with the views above indicated, is demanded by the genuine principles of republican simplicity and equality, by considerations of health and economy, by the fundamental appointments of nature, and the highest interests of life.

Compulsory service, or that which is an object of traffic, may perhaps be justly regarded as degrading, both to those who render and those who receive it. Voluntary service, on the contrary, or that which is freely, cheerfully, lovingly bestowed, is rather honorable and elevating. It would seem, indeed, by the precept of Christ, to be assigned the highest rank among human occupations; for it is written "*He that will be greatest among you, let him be your servant.*"

And, surely, the household which submits to the insolent insubordination of hired servants, or is compelled to suffer from their incapacity, is incomparably more disgraced than they who wait on themselves and each other. They are best served who serve themselves. They who are independent and self-reliant are most honorable and respectable; and they are least so who are willing to exist in helpless and humiliating dependence upon service grudgingly rendered by incompetent, unfaithful, or insolent menials. And there is

no grade of society in which the proper labor of life is less important as a means for the healthful and harmonious development of character and capacity, than for its results in promoting physical comfort and material prosperity.

It is therefore a mistaken tenderness which would exempt the lives of children from all that is disagreeable and laborious. It is the wisest and truest affection which enforces the discipline of useful labor. There is no intelligent Christian parent who would not see in his daughter the modest self-reliance, the cheerful obedience, and the graceful acceptance of the lot of life, with the developed capacity and strength which a habit of industry induces, rather than the fastidious distaste for useful employment, the disposition to self-indulgence, the love of extravagance and display, with the accompanying feebleness of all natural capacities, which the prevailing false tendencies of our social life, and the attendance of servants, can scarcely fail to produce.

The young girl, therefore, whatever her condition in life or position in society, should in all cases be disciplined in the common, useful, and necessary employments of domestic life. She should be taught to feel that it would be mean and dishonorable in her to attempt to avoid her proper share of the burden of life, and to seek to throw it upon others. The absence of domestic servants—if so fortunate a circumstance could be hoped for—would make this duty appear in its true light; and she would be industrious, not as a means of obtaining the requisite amount of physical exercise, but because industry is a necessary condition of comfortable human existence, and she would learn to understand and accept it as such. In this view alone could she receive the moral and practical discipline which this necessity was designed to confer.

Study would not then be a drudgery to her, and the relish for it which physical industry will materially assist in imparting, is in itself a most important element of successful education. The hours devoted to study, though fewer in number, will be doubly profitable if study takes its place in the daily routine. If, on the other hand, the alternative is only between study and play, the latter is always preferred, and this becomes comparatively insipid and profitless without the natural zest which belongs to it as a relief from the necessary industry of life.

The amount of time to be severally allotted to work, study, and amusement, at different periods of life, must, of course, be determined by the judgment of those who have the matter in charge. We simply insist that physical industry, as that element which is especially adapted to develop the real substance and stamina of life, is peculiarly and universally important, and is least of all to be omitted from the educational scheme.

Of course there is a discrimination to be made between the girl and the boy, as between the woman and the man, both as to the amount and kind of labor to be performed. It is only the meanest of mankind who would make women their drudges. Such degradation of woman belongs properly to the barbarous ages, and in our own times is desired only by those who approximate most nearly to the savage state.

Woman is indeed the "glory of the man," naturally reflecting his purest morality, and representing his noblest sentiment, capable also of tracing his loftiest thought. We find in her the truest type of humanity, its fairest blossoming, its highest promise. Such is the character and position we love to assign her. She should indeed be honored with the truest respect and cherished with the tenderest care. But we can not exempt her from the common experiences of our earthly lot, nor should we remove her from the conditions and deprive her of the opportunities which are most necessary for the successful and harmonious development of her various capacities and graces. Such a development can be attained only through the discipline of a true and useful life; and it would be well indeed if we could realize the extent of the deleterious efficiency of our present false ideals and tendencies in blighting the natural excellence and marring the essential beauty of "God's most perfect work."

When, therefore, the habit of industry above recommended is once enforced, and its true relation to the necessities and comforts of life understood and accepted, much will be done toward the attainment of another object which is also most important in its bearing on the general work of education. For if a portion of each day be necessarily devoted to industrial employments, the mind of the young girl will, in consequence, receive such an *impression of the value of time*, and the importance of a proper improvement of it, as could not possibly be produced by any other means.

Let her now be taught by repeated admonition and precept, accompanied by the necessary assistance and encouragement, that so much of her time as is not required for the common and useful industries of life, will, in general, be best and most profitably employed when devoted to mental improvement, and that this object should have the next claim upon her efforts.

What a world of abuse might in this manner be corrected! What hours and days and months and years of woman's life are worse than wasted by being devoted to objects which enfeeble the body, belittle the mind, and pervert the moral sense! How many women there are in respectable circles whose whole industrial capacity will scarcely suffice for the manufacture of their own apparel, even after the material is provided, and who, for an object so inconsiderable and disproportionate, are willing to leave the proper duties of life undischarged, and to allow all the rest of the burden of their existence to be borne by others!

To prevent such wicked waste of valuable time, the young girl should be encouraged to cultivate a habit of private reading and study, as the most agreeable, as well as the most profitable, use to which her leisure hours can be devoted. Such a habit is in itself a most important element of successful education; and her mind should be impressed with the truth that the time devoted to the reading of a carefully selected, useful, and entertaining book is worth incomparably more to her, as a matter of permanent advantage, than if spent in elaborating some article of perishable ornamental apparel. When she really appreciates this truth, she will be so far from indulging an inclination to waste and extravagance in matters of dress, that she will almost begrudge the time which she is compelled, by the customs of society, to devote to this object. She needs only to know the value of time for its higher and nobler uses, to become convinced of the folly and wickedness of the course at present so frequently pursued. If we can once lead her to a true realization and experience of the rich harvest to the mind and heart which awaits her in the fields of intelligent, intellectual culture, we shall break forever the power which has so long made so many of her sex the toiling slaves of fashion and folly.

We would not, however, be understood to discourage in the minds of young girls the cultivation of taste in matters of dress, nor a

becoming regard to personal appearance generally. Appreciation of the beautiful in material things is natural to woman, and constitutes, perhaps, one of her peculiar excellencies. It is only the perversion and abuse of this faculty, which, in an undue eagerness to adorn the body, would disfigure the life, that we would seek to correct; and there is at present little danger that any reform in these respects will be carried too far.

But it is, of course, one thing to apprehend in theory the true methods of development and culture, and another, and a very different thing, to pursue them in practice. It is, under any circumstances, a matter of extreme difficulty to change the settled customs or prevailing tendencies of society; and there are few who care to brave the unreasoning tyranny of social opinion, or to incur the penalties denounced by conventional law. It would, perhaps, indicate no very profound understanding of human nature, or of the principles which govern society, were we to expect that merely moral considerations would go far to effect the changes which our true interests plainly require. But it may not be unreasonable to hope that the admonitions of reason and conscience may be so enforced by the acknowledged dangers of the situation as at length to prevail even against the tyrannical follies of fashion and the madness of worldly ambition. Whether, indeed, considerations of this nature, as the truth becomes more apparent, and its significance is better understood, shall avail to work a substantial reform in our social and domestic systems, is a question involving the most serious consequences to every interest of the American people. Especially is the practicability of liberal education to thousands of American girls, whose circumstances are otherwise favorable, immediately and absolutely conditioned upon the success of such a reform. Without substantial physical health to render mental exertion safe and possible, without habits of industry to induce perseverance and application, with the enervating and dissipating tendencies of modern society instead of the mental balance and healthy moral tone which alone can give unity and consistency to the efforts of life, no matter what other advantages may be enjoyed, the work of the educator will be discouraging and doubtful, and the result unsatisfactory at the best, generally the mere shadow and pretense of education rather than its reality and substance.

On the other hand, with a vigorous physical health and the accompanying consciousness of capacity, with the habitual industry which makes effort easy and natural, with the substance of character and practical acuteness of mind which the same conditions will supply, and by means of which we may determine the tendencies of the life, the success of the educational effort will be as certain as its results are desirable.

But the discipline which secures these preliminary conditions belongs rather to the family than to the school or the college; it is the work of parents and moral advisers rather than of teachers and professors. In the family, in the training and habits of childhood and youth, the foundation of all noble development is to be laid. No after diligence can compensate for deficiency here. At no other period can so much be so easily done, to give a right direction to the character, and insure the success of the life. And the false ideals and tendencies, and the domestic and social habits which prevent the proper discipline of childhood, should be regarded as the deadliest enemies of all true civilization and progress. We have dwelt thus long upon the subject of physical health and its necessary conditions as affecting the practical work of education, because of its all-absorbing, all-conditioning importance. The remaining questions as to the kind of liberal education which is most desirable for young ladies, and the conditions under which they may best pursue it, also the manner in which the requisite institutions and other necessary facilities may be most readily provided, must be reserved for another paper.

III.—THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO CRIME.

IT must be apparent to the most casual observer that, if crime be not rapidly and fearfully on the increase, at least the masks and darkness which have hitherto covered its perpetration are being thrown off, and, like a giant of huge proportions, it is stalking forth in the open light, avoiding, ignoring, or defying law, setting aside or trampling upon the moral sense of community, and in its gilded forms demanding sanction and recognition. Few classes of society are exempt from its inroads, and few families but mourn over the fall of some one or more of their members. Petty thefts, highway robberies, burglaries, seductions, prostitution, suicides, and murders, each in its sphere seems to reign as a monarch, without question and without retribution. The more refined forms or modes of stealing are designated simply as "sharp trading;" a suicide is becoming quite a hero for being bold enough to end the ills he can not mend; murder is usually styled self-defense, or its perpetrator declared insane by a board of "competent physicians;" robbery on the most gigantic scale is only "dealing in stocks and bonds;" and liquor making and selling—the fruitful source of half of human woe—is a "legitimate business," in which any one can engage who has money enough to pay the license fee; and houses of prostitution are merely "social evils," to be very gently dealt with by and under the sanctions of law. With facts like these staining every page of day-history, poisoning the very life-blood, and threatening the ruin and destruction of the human race, every lover of morality and truth must deal; but specially do they address themselves to the Church—God's chosen means for the sanctification and salvation of man. To the Christian, therefore, must come the question, with appalling force, Whence or what the

CAUSE OR CAUSES OF CRIME?

No subtle distinctions will be attempted here between primary and secondary causes. It may be easily answered that human lust and passion, unbridled appetites and ungoverned tempers, are suffi-

cient to account for all crime. Some will dare to press the question so far as to say that God is himself the responsible cause, inasmuch as he created man with endowments capable of committing crime. If, however, it shall be found that, in spite of these natural endowments or faculties, God has also given other faculties and put other forces into the field, capable, if properly directed, of counteracting and overcoming the tendencies to evil and crime, then must it be considered, or at least will be by the writer, that those possessing such forces and failing to use them, become *particeps criminis*, and to such failure must be traced one very effective cause of crime. It is in this view of the case that the Church occupies a position of grave and fearful responsibility, only equaled by the dignity and glory of its calling. Has the Church discharged, or, more properly, is it at the present hour discharging, its heaven-imposed obligations with regard to the question of crime? Weighed in the Divine balance, which is so nicely poised as to quiver on its beam by the slightest touch of moral principle, it must be frankly confessed that the Church is comparatively powerless for the prevention of crime. It is hence to the Church and its relation to crime that the present paper will mainly confine itself, as large volumes would only suffice to grasp the question in all its bearings.

THE CHURCH DISORGANIZED.

If the New Testament be regarded as merely suggestive, instead of authoritative, on all questions pertaining to the Church, it may still be safely asserted that eighteen centuries have failed to produce a man, or a body of men, capable of suggesting as well. Numberless and fruitless have been the efforts to rival the utterances, whether considered as doctrinal or practical, whether taken in detachments or as an organic whole, of such men as Paul and Peter, James and John. And as to Christ, the ethical and æsthetical of all nations, the wisdom and philosophy of all times, not omitting to "summon spirits from the vasty deep," have been put under tribute to find Him a place simply as a man among men, but all in vain. The world's judgment is still ripening, and the world's verdict still being strengthened, in that there is One who stands without a peer, toward whom men can gaze, not simply to be made more like men, but more like God. Suggestive or authoritative, therefore, the New Testament

characters give more unity, force, and strength to the idea of organic law for the Church than can be found elsewhere. And because of this waiving the question of Divine inspiration, their suggestions become practically the only authority, and their sanction the only law. In the midst of the law and order, unity and harmony, which every-where prevail in the natural realm, it should certainly occasion great surprise and wonder if God should leave the spiritual realm without these elements or attributes, and the Church, his last and greatest work, the most destitute of all. Such can not be the case, and any thing looking in that direction must be accounted for upon other principles.

Disorganization practically means death; and, though the Church may have a name to live, it is safe to assert that it is not permeated with the idea of the Divine life, unless it works out the results designed by the Divine mind. One of these results, beyond all question, should be the elevation of man, the development of his moral and spiritual forces, and the subordination of the purely physical and animal to the moral and spiritual. Crime could not be committed under that condition of life; or, if committed, would be the accident of circumstances. But now the commission of crime, either within the very bosom of the Church or under the shadow of its sanctuaries, seems to be the order of the day, while the Church, if not "casting the stones," is "holding the garments" of those who do. Another result evidently to be gained through the Church, according to the Divine idea, is that of breaking down "middle walls of partition," so that all men may be brought together into the one family of God. Thus far, the Church seems to operate upon precisely the opposite principle, and consider that the greatest number possible of

DIVISIONS IN THE CHURCH

make it the better adapted to the wants of men. Nothing could be farther from the truth, since in the denominationalism of the day there exists but little, if any, of the legitimate power to unify and direct the Divine forces with which the Church was originally endowed. In morals, as in nations, the individuals must be counted before the masses can exist. The almost endless number and variety of little things, little duties, simple relations, daily works,—these aggregated make up the whole life and character of the Church.

Suppose that in a particular body or denomination these things are practically observed and carried out; yet as to that particular body, and any other particular body equally claiming to be the Church, there might be perpetual warfare. Paul, for example, forbids Christians to go to law with or against each other, but rather submit their grievances to their brethren, or endure the wrong. It is not difficult to find, at the present hour, many men and many congregations who recognize this principle and abide by it; insomuch that, in case of its violation, the person offending is held to trial for the offense. Grant such a condition or state to obtain in all the Churches so-called, and certainly very much seems to be gained, and gained upon the Divine plan. Add to the "going to law" question a thousand others, all equally important in their place, that go to make up the highest idea of a divine life in man, and one would be ready to exclaim, Truly, the tabernacle of God is with men! But not so; for the moment the denominational line is crossed, all restraints are thrown off, all obligations laid aside, all Christian recognition abolished, and, as between men of two different bodies, there exist only the rules which govern the heathen, the publican, and the sinner. Such can sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, drive sharp bargains, even withhold the common charities, and sometimes common courtesies, of life, simply because "we don't belong to the same Church." And thus is the Church shorn of her power to correct the errors of its own members, to say nothing of its utter helplessness in the presence of the fearful crimes of daily commission.

Does the Church know this? Will it ever know it? Will the time ever come when good and great men will rise above the narrow limits of petty opinions to the grand and sublime conception of the Church as the body of Christ, the great moral power to elevate, dignify, and save the lowly and sinful from eternal ruin and death? Will the Church ever have courage enough to denounce wickedness wherever found, and condemn sin because it is sin? Will the Church ever lay aside its worse than serpent's skin of disorganization and division, and, in the great field of the world, fight the battles of the Lord with a united front? It is not designed here to discuss, in its ordinary bearing, the question of Christian union, but simply to give some of the principles involved in the relation of the Church to crime.

Having stated that disorganization and division practically mean death, it may be elaborated from another point of view: by an appeal to faith, or, perchance, a lack of faith. Death, according to the New Testament, does not necessarily mean a ceasing to be or to exist. Paradoxical as it may appear, the New Testament measure of the two classes called the righteous and the wicked is, that the one is dead while living, the other living while dead,—dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God; living indeed unto sin, but dead unto God. Perhaps no more difficult task can be undertaken than to attempt to prove to a sinner that, while in the enjoyment of perfect physical health and life, he is, in fact, already dead in the sight of God. So the Church, maintaining as it does all the outward appearances of life, exhibiting even signs of vigor and growth, perpetuating itself after the most approved manner of its own judgment, is slow to believe that its life is mainly of its own infusion, instead of flowing from the life of God. Proud, self-satisfied, preaching the Gospel to but ten when it should to ten thousand, aping the fashions and conforming to the customs of the world, content to guard its aristocratic skirts from contact with the rude masses instead of opening its arms to those masses, it requires no small measure of faith in God's word to believe such a Church already dead to the life of God, and that its signs of life and activity are chiefly of its own production.

Another source of weakness to the Church, and incident thereto a cause of its inability to rebuke and repress crime, may be found in

THE CHARACTER OF ITS MINISTRY.

"Like priest, like people," has become a very popular expression, though just what is meant by it may not be so readily discerned. Possibly it is considered a Scriptural quotation; and that is sufficient to warrant its frequent use, without any very well-defined idea of its meaning. It is not Scriptural, however, though its opposite, "Like people, like priest," is; and under this form of expression may be found the true, and perhaps entire, philosophy of the ministerial character of the day. As in the times of Hosea, so in all times, the people are those who need to be educated and led by those placed over them. The priests are supposed to be capable and qualified for the work. If they do not falter; if they are true to the trust Heaven has reposed in them; if they are bold and fearless men, considering

the reproaches of Christ better than the honors of the world ; if they dare speak the truth, though the multitudes gnash on them with their teeth or stone them to death,—the final issue will not be doubtful. Some indeed may perish as martyrs, but the ultimate result must be the complete triumph of righteousness and truth. Not so, however, when the priest or preacher begins to compromise with the passions or the caprices of the people, and seeks to satisfy them where they are rather than to elevate them, and casts himself down instead of lifting them up.

Such is the *status* of the ministry at the present hour. Does a man, or a number of men, want any particular doctrine preached, they will not be long in finding a man to preach it. Dub him with D. D., give him a good house and a comfortable salary, and he preaches whatever the people want. "Like people, like priest."

Does a man desire all the promises of the Gospel and all the prospects of eternal life, without their duties and conditions? Straightway a free and unconditional Gospel is preached. Do men feel and acknowledge the necessity of purity and holiness in order to enjoy the next life, but prefer to enjoy sin in this life? Behold, at once the New Testament teems with the doctrine of a *post-mortem* Gospel, and many and able are its advocates. Must the Bible needs be set aside entirely? At once a whole troop of learned doctors are proclaiming it a book of the past, and denouncing its teachings as immoral and corrupting. Does Christ demand too much, and assert his right to rule over men in too absolute a manner? At once comes the priest to cater to the people, and straightway the Christ of the New Testament has taken his place simply as a good man among other good men.

Not even the existence of God himself escapes question and denial when once the wickedness of the people demands his name set aside ; for, true to the ancient saying, "Like people, like priest," there will be plenty of atheists to respond from the pulpit and press to the God-defying people. Nor does it ever seem to occur to these shameless leaders of a graceless crew that they have no thought of their own—are not originators, much less reformers, but simply imbecile, cowardly, and pliant tools in the hands of a sensual and corrupt populace, whose crimes they dare not rebuke, to whom the truth of God they dare not preach, and for whose money and good

living they have surrendered truth, manhood, and every grace that ought to adorn and beautify human character. With the Bible robbed of its inspiration, with Christ stripped of his authority, with God denied, and every human passion pandered to, and every human vice called a virtue of the lesser kind, and all this in the midst of organizations called the Church, what fruits but those of crime and shame can be expected?

But it may be well to be more specific, and point out somewhat particularly wherein the Church has departed from the Divine idea, and thus lost its power over the passions of men. In doing this, it is proper not so much to denounce open and persistent unbelief and infidelity as to show that the Church itself has paved the way to, and is therefore largely responsible for, the existing state of affairs. Law is practically law only when generally observed, or when it can be enforced. If by common consent a law be unworthy of being observed, or if by corruption and bribery those whose duty it is to see it executed are false to their trust, in either case the law becomes a dead-letter, or indeed worse than dead, since its existence without its enforcement gives license to the law-breaking principle. No difference in this will be found between the law of God and man, save that, as a mere question of power, God could enforce his law no matter how corrupt the people or how imbecile the priests. But he does not choose so to do, but rather leave man as he is, a voluntary agent, capable of obeying or disobeying as he may choose. This principle applied to the ministry, and we have, first,

THE ORDINANCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHANGED.

Under the first law of the Jewish Sabbath, rest and quiet were to reign supreme, excluding the kindling of fires and the cooking of food. But by long and persistent disobedience, during which time God gave his people over to hardness of heart, it came to pass that a Sabbath-day's journey could be performed, and no penalty come upon the heads of the offenders. This absence of punishment was tortured to signify God's approval, and thus the traditions of the fathers came to have more force than the commandment of God. In modern times we have a precise parallel. Take, for illustration, the ordinance of baptism and the Lord's-supper. Scarcely even a half-informed writer or critic can be found but is free to admit that these

ordinances were rigidly and sacredly observed by the early Christians, baptism being an immersion absolutely essential to Church membership, and the Lord's-supper an ordinance of at least weekly observance.

But human pride and passion, impatient of Divine restraint, began gradually to assert themselves, until these ordinances were considered not so much in the light of Divine authority as in the light of human convenience. A change in their observance was the result, and through the long ages to the present hour the only apology certain scholars can give for this change is the weak and false plea that the Church has a right, from time to time, to suit the ordinances of the New Testament to its own convenience! No such right exists more than to the Jew existed the right to change the law of the Sabbath. To call things by their right names, it is simply usurpation—that, and nothing less. No visible manifestation of God's displeasure marking the first innovation, the way is prepared for another and another, until now, except with one or two bodies, the original action and purpose of baptism have entirely disappeared from the Church, and the Lord's-supper exists principally in name. The next step which logically, or at least naturally, follows the change of the modes and purposes of Divinely appointed institutions is, that they are

NON-ESSENTIAL.

Infidelity is neither the result of natural organism nor of sudden transitions from a state of belief to unbelief. So far as the Bible and its questions are concerned, infidelity has been superinduced by the non-essentials of the Church; that is to say, by whatever right one man or Church declares one thing in the New Testament non-essential, by the same right another man or Church may declare another non-essential, until at length the whole is discarded. The moment the principle is established that human judgment or convenience may decide upon the necessity or non-necessity of observing any of Christ's commandments, that moment the way is opened for an entire and complete usurpation of the prerogatives belonging only to the Divine mind. That this has been done by the Church, it were folly to deny; that general lethargy or entire skepticism as to religious obligations and Divine authority has followed, is equally

plain. It neither palliates nor explains this course to assert that some of these ordinances are outward and formal. It is a question of no possible consideration *what* the appointments are ; it is only, *From whom* do they derive their sanction ? That being settled as Divine, it follows in the simplest manner, that no law however stringent, no obligation however sacred, will long be observed after irreverence for God has so fully matured as to place human authority instead of his. The sanctions of law once destroyed, under their highest and most sacred forms, no one need affect surprise to find the whole category of moral obligations dispensed with, whenever greed of gain, lust, passion, appetite, pride, or revenge may suggest. Thus are the flood-gates of crime thrown wide open, with appeals to every possible avenue through which sin and Satan can approach the human soul ; while the Church, intended of God as the great conserving force of life and character, stands looking idly on, or lifts up a voice but faintly heard, because of its louder clamors for its self-constituted forms, doctrines, and practices.

To specially represent this principle, and at the same time properly characterize the ministry, take what are usually denominated "death-bed repentances," but more particularly that class openly criminal, and who die under the law of the land for their crimes. In such cases, it is become notorious that, contrary to the apostle John, murderers do inherit eternal life. Let it once be known that a man is to be hung, and ministers seem to vie with each other in bestowing their kindly offices in prayer and counsel, and specially in the well-prepared speech put into the criminal's mouth to make upon the scaffold, to the effect that he is reconciled to God, feels very happy, forgives the man he murdered, hopes to meet him soon in heaven, and while he does not exactly advise others to murder also in order to get a quick and safe passport to heaven, feels sure that he at least would have remained a dreadful sinner for years to come, and been kept out of heaven indefinitely, but for the happy consummation of a life of crime in one fell stroke that is now about to send him to glory and to God ! Nay, he is not so certain either that it was the murder that consummated such glorious ends ; in fact, thinks, on the contrary, he might have committed a dozen more murders if he had not been arrested and found guilty. The wretch is therefore really sorry, not for his murder, but that he was caught ! Shame on

such a ministry! We would have consolation and sympathy proffered as long as man is within their reach; but who can comfort whom God comforteth not? Besides, what more could a minister do to aid and encourage lives of guilt and crime than he does when, by their dying bed or under the dreadful gallows, he assures them that a moment of true penitence will outweigh a life of sin and shame? No wonder the world scoffingly inquires, "Why all this pretense at religion, these long prayers, these self-denials, these persecutions and cross-bearings, these gigantic expenditures of money, of heart and brain, and nerve and life,—wherefore all these, when a life steeped in crime, and rounded up by murder and the rope, can at once be transformed into the likeness of God and his Christ?" Again we say, shame upon the ministry who have prostituted God's grace to the scoffings and vile uses of the reckless and criminal of every hue and class!

Steps must be retraced; many things, hoary with years, venerable for their antiquity, or sacred because of the Fathers, must be set aside; customs and practices in the name of religion, having no higher than human sanction must be discarded; creeds and councils bearing the impress of usurpation must be abolished; the Church must be unified in all that relates to the positive of the Divine appointment; the Bible must be reinstated in the Church as the only book of authority, and the voice of the Church, as the voice of one man, must be heard denouncing wickedness in high or low places, rebuking sin whether in its low and filthy brothels or its gilded palaces, and bringing all men to see that law, both human and Divine, is designed for their good, and that only by its observance, and by a life of observance, can they expect to escape its penalties, or enter into the enjoyment of its promised rewards. When the Church and its ministry shall fully realize and act upon the God-given principles which have been committed to their trust, then, and not till then, may we expect to find in the field of good a grand array of moral forces, capable of coping with the enemy, of beating back the fearful and gigantic waves of crime, and of establishing in their stead the peaceful, pure, and holy principles contained in that enunciation, "Peace on earth and good-will among men." If such results can not be accomplished by the Church, if its own pride and stubbornness stand in its pathway toward the attainment, there can be little

doubt but God will, at no very distant day, "remove the candlestick out of its place." One more phase of crime with which the Church does least where most ought to be done, is that usually styled the

SOCIAL EVIL.

In this department of crime, much more might be said than will be attempted here; but enough will be given to become at least suggestive as to the duty of the Church in the premises.

The first thing to be appreciated in order to the treatment of disease is its peculiar type; and, secondly, the extent to which it has taken hold of the patient. The social evil may justly be styled the most malignant form of moral disease; and the most superficial must have observed the alarming extent to which it prevails. Admitting the existence and power of lust and passion, but claiming that they ought to be, and under certain conditions can be, kept within lawful bounds, it may be claimed that two facts will explain the prevalence and fearful power of the social evil. These are, first, the utter lack of sympathy and aid on the part of women for the guilty of their own sex; and, second, if not the absolute favor with which many men known to be libertines are received into society, at worst but a half-rebuking, half-smiling recognition of their presence. Few can have failed to notice that a fallen woman is most quickly deserted and most loudly condemned by her own sex, while, perchance, the very moment after one has lifted up holy hands of horror over her unfortunate sister, she turns and lavishes most winning smiles upon her seducer and destroyer. It may be, and is, claimed that it is dangerous for woman to interest herself in the reform of the fallen, lest her motives may be suspected or her character maligned. This is but an artifice of the devil to hold fast those already in his grasp. Evil does not come to one's door and ask to be destroyed; sin seeks darkness rather than light; and he or she who would reform the sinful must seek them in their abodes of sin. If it be true that contact is dangerous, that evil is absolutely more powerful than good, then at once may the whole struggle be abandoned as one of unequal proportions, the preponderance being in favor of the evil. But this is not true. Fidelity to and courage in the prosecution of what is right must always bring victory to the side of right. Equally false and unjust is the principle above alluded to, that of receiving into good society

men of notoriously degraded and sensual habits ; men thoroughly corrupt as to every moral principle ; men who have no such term as female virtue in their vocabulary, and who boldly avow their belief that every woman has her price,—such men possessing, and only possessing, what society calls “wealth and position” as the ground on which they are not simply tolerated, but sought after. The instances are not few where planning and plotting mothers have sacrificed their daughters at the shrine of the idolatrous worship of wealth and fashion, when they had positive knowledge that he to whom they gave their daughters was lacking in every principle of virtue and truth.

The relation of the Church to these questions is obvious. Its voice must be heard like the voice of a thousand thunders, recalling the attention of the world to the primitive character of its faith and practice, to its recognition of persons solely upon their moral qualities ; and specially must it point to the examples of Christ in his ministrations of love and mercy among the lowly and the fallen. Christian women must be taught that to save one soul from death will be a brighter gem in the crown of their future than all the wealth and splendor that earth can give ; and that foremost in the ranks of those who deplore and desire to contribute to the destruction of the social evil, must they stand, detesting alike its hideous forms, whether found with woman or man, and placing, if upon the former, equally upon the latter, the ban of social ostracism, until a “fallen man” shall find no more recognition than a fallen woman, nor either find the slightest sympathy only as he or she accepts it in pledge of a reformation and new life. Let the Church do all this. Let it do more : let it tear off the mask which covers, and expose to view, the sin and crime which lurk beneath ; let it abolish the factitious distinctions between garnished wickedness and open crime, between accidental fortune and honest poverty, between the costly trappings of the rich and the plain apparel of the poor ; let it cry aloud and spare not,—and not doubtful will be the issue. With the Church true to its divine behests, that hydra-headed monster, crime, must at least withdraw itself from the open light ; and if its many heads be not altogether severed from its huge body, they shall certainly be diminished, until its name shall not be legion, its power not the dominant one of earth, nor its foul breath the infectant of every class and condition of human life.

IV.—CHURCH POLITY.

AT first, it seems strange that there should be such diversity of opinion on what is usually called "Church government." All agree that something like government is necessary, but the difficulty seems to be to settle on a *policy of administration*. Some favor an administration by (ἐπίσκοποι) bishops, and advocate "episcopacy" as the primitive form of government in the Church. Others prefer an administration by (πρεσβύτεροι) presbyters or elders, understanding these to be a distinct class of officers differing from bishops, and they are advocates of the Presbyterian administration. A third class advocate a Congregational administration; that is, such a (πολιτεύμα) policy as shall permit all the members of any given Church to have an equal voice in all matters appertaining to its management and discipline.

Episcopacy is variously modified, as in the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, the English Episcopal, the American Episcopal, and the Methodist Episcopal Churches. Presbyterianism has but slight modifications. Congregationalism is also slightly modified. Sometimes the word is used to express the idea that each congregation is independent of all others, and sometimes to indicate that the congregation, as such, when distinguished from its officers, administers its own government.

There is much said in America concerning "self-government." Congregationalism, in relation to a congregation, is what self-government is in relation to one's self—a *doing just what one pleases to do*. All such persons, "being without law, are a law to themselves." This is lawlessness. So of a State. The *State* is not governed, it governs; it is not "under law," but it makes law. So of a Church,—if it is self-governed, it is governed not in the sense of *authority*, but without, if not in opposition to, authority. It is simply lawless.

Impatience of restraint is a part, if not the whole, of "total depravity." It is found not only in the State, but in the Church also; not only in individuals, but also in communities, civil and ecclesiastic. People often speak of *freedom*, not in opposition to *slavery*, but in opposition to the requirements and the restraints of law. It is

considered greatly in favor of some Churches that they allow their members to do as they please, even as to the observance or non-observance of some of the commands of Christ.

But there is such a thing as government in the Church of God. "God set some in the Church, apostles first; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, GOVERNINGS, diversities of tongues." Of the "prophesyings" it was said, "They will be done away," and of the diversity of tongues, "They will cease." Not so of the "governings." These must necessarily continue.

The word (κυβέρνειν) employed by the apostle in the above passage, properly signifies *a steering, a pilotage*. (See Plato, Rep. 488 b.) In the New Testament it is used for *a governing, direction*—the concrete for *governors, directors*. The Septuagint uses this word in Prov. xi, 14, for the Hebrew word for *direction*. "Where there is no *direction*, the people fall; but in the multitude of counselors is safety."

The man who governs, steers, or pilots a vessel is called (κυβερνήτης) *a governor or director* of the vessel. (Acts xxvii, 11; Rev. xviii, 17.) The Latins called him *gubernator*. These Greek words are from the verb κυβερνάω; Latin, *gubernare, to steer*—metaphorically, *to guide, to govern*. If, then, the Church be regarded as a ship, she is furnished with governors or steersmen; if as a house or household, she is furnished with governors or directors. These steersmen must understand their charts, steer by the compass, and observe all the laws of navigation. They must, moreover, steer for the port for which the ship was "cleared."

It may help us to settle the question of administration to premise that the government of which we are speaking is, in a certain sense, (θεοκρατία) *a theocracy*, a Divine government called (βασιλεία) the "kingdom" of God, of Christ, and of heaven. The head of this government is (μονάρχος) *a monarch*. As to the making of laws, he rules alone. "All power in heaven and on earth" is his. In fact, he is (αυτοκρατής) *an autocrat*, an absolute prince or sovereign. His government is the farthest possible remove from a democracy, a republic, or even (ἀριστοκρατία) *an aristocracy*. There is no room in it for pope, cardinal, nor canon law. In relation to ecclesiastical dignity, we are positively commanded not to call any one on earth our pope or father. There is but one "Holy Father"—God himself—

whom Jesus called "Holy Father." (John xvii, 11.) To call any one on earth "Holy Father" is profane, and a violation of the law of Christ.

In considering the subject of the kingdom of God, and its bearing on the question of Church polity, it is well to notice the following passages :

"Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you to myself. Now, therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak to the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the (τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τοῦ λαοῦ, Sept.) *elders of the people*, and laid before their faces all the words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered him together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do. And Moses returned the words of the people to the Lord." (Ex. xix, 3-8.)

Here is a solemn covenant entered into between Jehovah and the people whom he brought out of the land of Egypt. He proposes, and they accept. He proposed to take them as "a peculiar treasure above all people," and to constitute them a "kingdom of priests" to himself. Not that every man in this kingdom was to be a priest, but that it was to be not only a civil, but also a religious, organization, having a priesthood.

This proposal was made on condition that the children of Israel would obey his voice indeed, and keep his covenant. The proposition was made to the people through their elders, and by them, in mass, accepted.

The elders here mentioned did not include all the old men of the people, but a class of men of mature age and judgment, who were representatives of the people. The office of elder is very ancient. It existed in Egypt when Joseph was there, before the days of Moses. When Joseph went up to bury his father, "the elders of Pharaoh's house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt," went with him. (Gen. 1, 7.) The *caldermen* of the old Saxons and the *aldermen* of England were officials of dignity. Among the Saxons they were senators and peers. These terms, both etymologically, mean eldermen or elders. All the heads of families and tribes in ancient civilizations

were elders. The office did not originate among the Israelites, but was adopted by them from higher civilizations. The suggestion of Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, seems to refer to this usage in Midian, a country generally supposed to have lain along the eastern coast of the Red Sea. But this office of elder, in this ancient kingdom, does not rest on the ancient usage of nations. It has higher authority.

"The Lord said to Moses, Gather to me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them to the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there: and I will take of the spirit which is on thee, and will put it on them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone." (Num. xi, 16, 17; see also verses 24, 25.)

These (ἐβδουμήκοντα ἀνδρας ἀπὸ των πρεσβυτέρων Ἰσραηλ) *seventy men from the elders of Israel* were religious teachers, as is evident from verses 24, 25, 26: "And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people, and set them around the tabernacle. And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spoke to them, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it to the seventy elders: and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested on them, they prophesied, and did not cease. But there remained two of the men in the camp, the name of the one was Eldad, and the name of the other Medad: and the spirit rested on them; and they were of them that were written [enrolled], but went not to the tabernacle: and they prophesied in the camp."

These elders were selected by Moses, not at the suggestion of Jethro, but by the command of the Lord. The suggestion of Jethro included many hundreds, if not many thousands. But this number was limited to seventy. This is supposed by many to be the origin of the Jewish Sanhedrim in the times of our Savior.

We desire the fact to be remembered that in this kingdom there was a religious order of men called (πρεσβύτεροι) *elders*. They are called elders of Israel, elders of the people, and elders of (τῆς συναγωγῆς, Sept.) *the synagogue*; in the common version, elders of the congregation, *of the mass* or *multitude*, regarded as one people, or as assembled.

God was the king of this people until they objected to being governed by the judges, and desired to have a king. This was accounted as a rejection of God who gave them these judges; and he told his prophet to anoint a king for them, and he gave them Saul as their first. Samuel told the people when "the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said to me, Nay, but a king shall reign over us, when the Lord your God was your king." It must be observed that the kingdom was the same, although there was a change of kings. The elders were continued all through the times of the judges and under the kings.

This kingdom of priests, after the death of Saul, was made hereditary in the family of David, the son of Jesse. The Lord said to him:

"Also the Lord told thee that he will make thee a house [that is, a family]. And when thy days are fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever." (2 Sam. vii, 11-16.) "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn to David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven." (Ps. lxxxix, 3, 4, 29.) "Men, brethren, I may speak freely to you of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his sepulcher is among us unto this day. Being a prophet therefore, and knowing that God swore to him with an oath, that of the fruit of his loins one should sit on his throne, he, foreseeing, spoke of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was his soul abandoned to the underworld, nor did his flesh see corruption." (Acts ii, 29-31.)

In anticipation of this, the spirit of prophecy said:

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor [אל גִּבּוֹר, *el gibbor*,] the prevailing God, the

Father of eternity [*Abi ad*], the Prince of Peace [or prosperity, *sar shalom*]. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." (Isa. ix, 6, 7.)

The officers who were called the (*πρεσβύτεροι*) *elders* of Israel, in Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 1 Chronicles, and Ezekiel, are also called by the same name in Acts iv, 8: "Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit," said, "Rulers of the people, and elders of Israel."

The kingdom of priests to God, organized in the days of Moses, governed by judges for four hundred years, over which Saul afterward reigned, and which was transferred to David, and made perpetual in his family, is the same kingdom the setting up of which Daniel prophesied, John the Baptist preached as the "kingdom of heaven," and "the kingdom of God," and that to the throne of which Jesus was raised without seeing corruption. It had its ups and downs, but God finally set it up, never again to be prostrated. In its deepest adversities and its darkest gloom it still survived, and will, according to the promise of God, "while the sun and moon endure." And when the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed, Jesus will deliver it up to God the Father, who originally founded it as a kingdom of priests to himself.

Some changes were made at different times in its government, as the interests and development of the people required, but it remained the same kingdom. The greatest change was made when its greatest king was raised up to sit on "the throne of David."

When the "child that was born, the Son that was given, took the government on his shoulder, and became manifest as Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the Father of eternity, and the Prince of Peace," the import of the declaration, "Of the *increase of his government and peace* there shall be no end," found its explanation in the fact that "all power in heaven and on earth" was given "to this son of David." But be it remembered that this "*increase of his government*" took place when he sat "upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever."

The greatest change in the history of this kingdom consisted in the exclusion of the Jews, who had forfeited all claims to the blessings of it by the rejection of "Jesus the son of David," and giving it to another class of people which would bring forth the fruits thereof. How harmless and how patriotic the disciples were when they asked Jesus, "Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel!" He gave them to understand that their mission was not to be confined "to Israel," but that they were to be his witnesses, "both in Jerusalem, in all Judea, and Samaria, and to the utmost part of the earth."

Israel having forfeited all claims to the blessings of his kingdom by rejecting the last heir of David to the throne, and the pagans having never had any rights in it, the king now ordains that no one can be a citizen except "those who believe (*πιστεύουσιν εἰς ὄνομα υἱοῦ τοῦ*) in his name; who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." He therefore told Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, that "except one be born of water and of Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii, 5.) Jesus had told the Jews, who disallowed the stone that was made the head of the corner, "Therefore I say to you, that the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." None but fruit-bearing people now are subjects. And it makes no difference whether such are Jews or Greeks, bond or free, barbarians or Scythians, male or female, they are all one in Christ Jesus, and have all been "baptized into one body," not into "various Christian denominations."

The question now arises, what difference is there between the ordinances, officers, and laws of the kingdom since the accession of "Jesus the son of David, according to the flesh," who was also "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead?"

As to the ordinances, "the circumcision which is outward in the flesh" gives place to "the circumcision of the heart, whose praise is not of men but of God." No natural birth, whether of the blood of Abraham, or of any other man, can avail any thing in this kingdom now; nor can a birth of the will of the flesh, whether legitimate or illegitimate, or by the desire of man for the sake of a house or family. It matters not whether the father is a patriarch, prophet, priest, or a king, believer or unbeliever. No one but he who is "born of God,"

"of water and of Spirit," who "believes in the name" of Christ, can enter into this kingdom. All his subjects are "taught of God, from the *least unto the greatest* of them." John the Baptist, the herald of the new King, told the people that parentage, even that of Abraham, availed nothing. "Think not to say among yourselves that we have Abraham for a father;" "The ax is laid at the root of the trees; therefore every tree that brings not good fruit is cut down and cast into the fire."

The (*δίκαιωματα*) *ordinances*, or the ritual of "*Divine service*," "under the first covenant," whether appertaining to the "worldly sanctuary" of the tabernacle or the temple, with all the furniture, vestments, priests, and "diverse baptisms" or immersions, whether of priests, or parts of sacrifices, are treated as a mere (*παραβολή*) "*figure* for the time present." They could not perfect the performer of religious service as to the conscience. Christ as a high-priest more than filled the place of the entire priesthood under the old covenant, and became the "mediator of a new covenant." He is a royal "priest forever according to the order of Melchisedek." The ordinances of his kingdom under the "new covenant" are baptism and the Lord's-supper. The latter is commemorative, but not emblematic, of his death; the former is an (*εμβλημα*) *emblem* of his death, burial, and resurrection from the dead. See Rom. vi, 4: "We are buried with him, therefore, *by the immersion* (*τῷ βαπτισματι*) into his death; that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life." "Being buried with him (*ἐν τῷ βαπτισματι*) *in the immersion*, wherein ye were also raised with him through the faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead."

The laws of Christ are unlike those under "the old covenant." They are not codified; but certain principles are stated, and made the ground of exhortation and single commands covering our entire duty to God and man. They take not on the *form* of law, and we are therefore said not to be under law, but under grace. It is not a legal, but a gracious, administration of the kingdom of God.

THE OFFICERS OF THE KINGDOM.

This brings us near to the points of disagreement among Christians on the subject of "Church government." Some of these

officers were designed to be temporary, and others continuous. Those for whose continuance no provision was made, were of the temporary class, as apostles and prophets. No official was instructed as to the qualification and ordination of either of these. They, as apostles and prophets, had no successors, not even Judas Iscariot. He had a *substitute*, but not a *successor*. As a *witness* and as *overseer*, Mathias was his *substitute*. He was "made a witness," with the apostles, of Christ's resurrection. (Acts i, 22.) And that he was an *overseer* is evident from Peter's application of this prophecy to him:

"Let his habitation be made desolate,
And let no one dwell therein."

Let another take (τὴν ἐπίσκοπην αὐτοῦ) his "*overseership*," not "his bishopric," nor his "office" merely. The Hebrew (בְּקִרְתּוֹ) *pokudato*, overseership, is, in the Septuagint, rendered (τὴν ἐπίσκοπην) the *office of overseer*, and in the *vulgate*, *episcopatum*, the Greek word Latinized, like the English word *baptize*, from the Latin *baptizo*, from the Greek (βαπτίζω) *baptidzo*, I immerse.

The word here used of the office of Judas is the same that is translated in the common version "bishopric," and "the office of a bishop." The Saxons, from whom we derive the word bishop, used the word *biscop*, which literally signifies an *overseer* or *superintendent*.

The following is the use of the word in the Septuagint, from which the New Testament writers obtained it:

Num. xxxi, 14: "And Moses was angry with the *captains of the army*—the heads of thousands, and the heads of hundreds, who came from the battle array." Here the word (ἐπίσκοποι) bishops, as translated in the common version of the New Testament, simply means commanders of thousands, and the commanders of hundreds—about equivalent to "colonels" and "captains" with us. These were military, not ecclesiastical, bishops. Zebul is called the (ἐπίσκοπος) *bishop* of Jerobaal. (Jud. ix, 28.) This is not the ecclesiastic use of the word. Brenton, the late translator of the Septuagint, renders the word by "steward."

It is written (2 Kings xi, 15; Sept., 4 Kings xi, 15,) that Jehoiada the priest commanded the captains of the hundreds, (κατοντάρχους τοῖς ἐπισκόποις) the officers of the host [army], to take Athalia forth,

and slay her "with the sword." Here the (ἐπίσκοποι) *bishops*, or captains, are called officers of the army.

In the eighteenth verse of the same chapter, it is written that "the priest appointed (ἐπισκόπους εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου) *overseers* in the Lord's house;" that is, for the house, to take the oversight or care of it. This is neither a military nor ecclesiastic sense.

In Job xx, 29, and Wisd. i, 6, a Hebrew name (לַאֵל) of God is translated (ἐπίσκοπος) *episcopos*, by personification, as we use the word Providence when we mean God. This is neither a military, ecclesiastical, nor civil use of the word.

Joel, the son of Zichri, was the (ἐπίσκοπος) *overseer* of nine hundred and twenty-eight of the sons of Benjamin, who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon. This is a civil use of the word.

In a prophecy relative to the glory and happiness of the people of God, occasioned by converts from the heathen, it is written, in the Septuagint, (καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἀρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ) *I will appoint thy rulers in peace, and thy overseers in righteousness*. This is an instance of the use of the word in relation to civil affairs.

Robinson defines it "*an inspector, overseer, guardian*." It is used of *treaties*, by Homer, II, 22, 225; Hdian, 7, 10, 6; of *laws*, by Plutarch, Sol. 19; of *laws*, by Homer, Od. 8, 163; of *cities*, by Josephus, Ant. 10, 4, 1; of *a patron*, as Minerva of Athens, Dena, 4, 26, 27. The Athenians called the magistrates, who were sent to tributary cities to organize and to govern them, (ἐπίσκοποι) *overseers*. Schol. in Aristoph. Av. 1023; Boeckh Staatshaush. der Ath. 1, pp. 168, 256; Neander Gesch. der Pflanz. u. Leit der chr. Kirche, 1, p. 178; and Bibl. Repos. iv, p. 254. (Robinson.)

If the (ἐπίσκοποι) *overseers* of the Septuagint, the version of the Old Testament read by the Jews in and out of synagogues in the times of the apostles, were in command of soldiers, some of thousands, and some of hundreds, they were invested with an authority recognized by the soldiers, and commensurate with their commands. They were *commanders* (τῆς δυνάμεως) *of the force*. It has never been the habit of military officers to allow the rank and file to recommend movements, nor do they submit their movements to a vote of the soldiers. The military rule is the most *efficient*, whether the best or

not. All bodies of people must be governed by *some visible representative of authority*. For some reason, the members of Churches pay less respect to ecclesiastical officers than to civil officers. Extreme congregationalism, in whatever denomination, has largely contributed to this state of things. The appointment of improper, incompetent, and ineligible persons to the overseer's office, is another source of the same difficulty. The manner of selecting them by a vote of the Church is of very doubtful propriety. No Church, as such, was ever instructed and directed in relation to their qualifications and ordination. Timothy, who was commanded to do the work of an evangelist, and Titus, his worthy coadjutor in the ministry, were, as evangelists, instructed in these matters.

"Faithful is the saying, If any one desires the office of overseer (*ἐπισκοπος*), he desires a good work. The overseer, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife; sober, discreet, orderly, hospitable, apt in teaching; not given to wine, not a striker, but forbearing, averse to strife; not a lover of money; governing well his own house, having his children in subjection with all decorum. (But if one knows not how to govern his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?) Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil."

If the primary meaning of the English word *preside* (Latin, *presidere*; *præ*, before, and *sedere*, to sit)—namely, "to occupy the place of ruler or director"—is understood, it will do well for a translation of the Greek verb. But if it is to be understood merely as acting as chairman of a meeting, it fails to express the sense of the original, which is here used in reference to *keeping children in subjection*. (1 Tim. iii, 3-5.)

To this evangelist, then, the office, the qualifications, and the authority of an overseer are clearly stated. So, also, to Titus.

"For this cause I left thee behind in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint elders in each city, as I directed thee; if any one is without reproach, the husband of one wife, having believing children, not accused of rioting or unruly. For the overseer must be without reproach, as God's steward; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, not a striker, not greedy of gain, but hospitable, a lover of the good, discreet, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word according to the teaching,

that he may be able with sound teaching both to exhort and refute the gainsayers."

The fact that Titus was left by the apostle behind in Crete to *appoint* elders, is evidence that they received not their office by *election*, but by *appointment*. These elders are called overseers in verse 7. A Church, as a body, is not capable of judging whether a man is qualified for the office or not. This accounts for the fact that there are very few among all who are elected to this office who are at all qualified to fill it. They are generally ineligible because incompetent.

Paul identifies (πρεσβύτεροι) *elders*, and (ἐπίσκοποι) *overseers*, as we have seen in his letter to Titus. He does the same thing in another case. (Acts xx, 28.) He told the elders in Ephesus that the Holy Spirit had made them overseers of the Church of the Lord, and that they, as such, should feed this flock of God. The verb ποιμαίνειν means more than *to feed*. It embraces all the acts implied by superintending. The noun ποιμήν means *one who tends flocks or herds*. Metonymically, it means *a pastor, superintendent, guardian*. The office of elder, overseer, and pastor, is the same. This is evident from the fact that Paul makes elders and overseers the same, and that he requires the latter to do, as their proper work, what is included in the duty of a pastor.

If, then, *elders* (πρεσβύτεροι) and (ἐπίσκοποι) *bishops or overseers* are different names for the same officers, nothing can be proved in favor of Presbyterianism from the one which can not be proved in favor of Episcopalianism from the other. And neither of these words comports, in the Scripture acceptation, with the idea of Congregationalism, in the sense of a Church vote in discipline. As little do Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism, as held in England and America, comport with the usage of these words. As shown from Num. xxxi, 14, one man was an overseer of a thousand, and another of a hundred, but neither of them of a "*diocese*." Zebul is called the (ἐπίσκοπος) *bishop* of Jerubbaal. (Judg. ix, 28.) This was a small "*bishopric*," and a curtailed "*diocese*." The bishops of treaties and of laws illy comport with the idea of a diocese. As little does the word agree with Presbyterian synods and general assemblies.

The elders or bishops of Ephesus were officers of that Church only. They had no jurisdiction anywhere else. This city was the metropolis of Asia Minor, or the Smaller Asia, on the shore of the

Ionian Sea, and afforded great facilities for the spread of the Gospel. In no city was greater excitement produced by Paul's preaching; and such was his success here that the historian said, "So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed!" But all the converts in this city constituted but one Church—"the Church of Ephesus." So of all the other cities. This explains what Paul says to Titus, 1, 3: "For this cause I left thee behind in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint elders *in every city, as I directed thee.*" Nearly, if not all, the primitive Churches were founded in cities—one in each city. In each of these cities there was an eldership, consisting of a plurality of elders probably, because what was called the Church in Jerusalem, Ephesus, and other cities, was entirely too numerous to meet in one place.

The apostolic order might be restored, say in Cincinnati, or any other city, if all the "denominations" would abandon all their unscriptural names and practices, and adopt the Scripture names and practices, and form an eldership by making each of their ministers or pastors a member of that body. Then it would be, not the Episcopal or Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian, the Baptist, and the Christian Church, but "the Church of God, which is in" Cincinnati.

The next thing would be to settle the question of their authority, not as relates to territory—for the limits of the city Church would settle that—but as to the kind and extent of their control of the interests of the Church.

To settle this question, we must examine the Old Testament, from which the words (ἐπίσκοποι) *bishops* and (πρεσβύτεροι) *elders* are brought into the New, without any intimation of any change of meaning. Of course I here refer to the Greek translation in use when the Messiah and the apostles were teaching.

"And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people." This was done on the suggestion of Jethro, his father-in law. These men are called *overseers* in Num. xxxi, 14. In Ex. xviii, 25, from which the above is quoted, "They judged the people at all seasons," in all cases, when they considered themselves competent. "The hard causes they brought to Moses." They were judges, oyer and terminer, to hear and determine causes among the people.

"When the Lord was about to organize the children of Israel into

"a kingdom of priests," he said to Moses, "Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel." When Moses went to communicate this message, "he came and called for (*τούς πρεσβυτέρους τοῦ λαοῦ*) *the elders of the people*, and laid before their faces all the words which the Lord commanded him." These elders must, then, have communicated the message to their people; for it is said that "all the people answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do!" These elders, who were the judges of the people and decided their matters of difficulty, were also their *teachers* of the Lord's commands. Cities had their elders, who transacted their public business. (See Deut. xix, 12; xxi, 3, 6, 19; xxii, 8; Joshua xx, 4.)

We have already shown that the seventy elders of Israel (Num. 11, 19,) were prophets or religious teachers. The law which Moses wrote was delivered to the priests, the sons of Levi, who bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord, "and to all the elders of Israel." (Deut. xxxi, 9.) At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel came to appear before the Lord, they were to read this law before all Israel in their hearing. This was a grand scene, when a whole nation, with their men, women, and children, and the stranger who was within their gates, stood up and listened to the reading of God's law, "that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord, your God, and observe to do all the words of this law; and that their children, which have not known, may hear and learn to fear the Lord, your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it." Elders of Churches may learn a useful lesson from this circumstance.

The elders of Israel inducted into office. "So all the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron; and King David made a league with them in Hebron before the Lord; and they anointed David king over Israel." (2 Sam. v, 3.)

The elders were teachers of the traditions of their people in the time of Jesus. The scribes and Pharisees said, "Why do thy disciples transgress the traditions of the elders, for they wash not their hands when they eat bread." (Matt. xv, 2.) They still retained their character as teachers.

They were high in authority and influence at that time. "From

that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be put to death, and rise on the third day." (Matt. xvi, 21.) It was considered part of their duty to guard their people against innovations and impositions. They were considered the authorized teachers of the people. When Jesus was teaching in the temple, the chief priests and the elders asked him, "By what authority dost thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" (Matt. xxi, 23. See also Luke xxii, 66.) They were a part of the council which put Jesus to death. Without their consent, he could not have been crucified. They were an important part of the court. In the morning came the "chief priests and elders of the people," and they "took counsel against Jesus, so as to put him to death." (Matt. xxvii, 1.) This shows how highly their authority was regarded in civil matters in their theocracy. (See also Acts iv, 5 ; vi, 12.

The religious element runs through all these transactions. They blended civil and religious, and even criminal, matters. The crime which they charged against Jesus was that of having deceived the people in regard to religious affairs ; and they held that he should be put to death on that account. The authority which was conferred on them under their theocracy was abused by them. Their government being a mixed government, partly secular and partly religious, their elders participated in both kinds of authority. The kingdom of Christ not being of this world—not being secular—his elders are not clothed with any civil authority. The words *elders* and *overseers* retain their Old Testament and etymological meaning, whether used of civil or religious things, or of tens, fifties, hundreds, or thousands.

The kingdom of heaven has come, and the Jews having forfeited all claims to its blessings, Jesus excluded them, and seeks only such subjects as are born again—of water and Spirit. He has his elders and overseers to see to the administration of his laws, and the consequent prosperity of his subjects. As his government is ecclesiastic, and not secular, their powers must be correspondent.

That there were elders in the Church in Jerusalem—the first Church of Christ—is evident, although we have no account of their selection and appointment. There was a time when "prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch. And one of them, named Agabus,

stood up and signified, by the Spirit, that there should be a great dearth over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. And the disciples, according as any one was prospered, determined, each of them, to send relief to the brethren dwelling in Judea. Which also they did, sending it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. (Acts xi, 30.) This gives prominence to that class of men in Jerusalem.

"Certain men coming down from Judea" to Antioch, "taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised, according to the custom of Moses, ye can not be saved." They, therefore, sent Paul and Barnabas, with others, to Jerusalem, "to the apostles and elders, about this question." The apostles and the elders came together to consider this matter. The subject was fully discussed and decided by these men in presence of the whole Church, who, approving what was officially decided by their authorized tribunal, determined to send "Barsabas and Silas, leading men among the brethren," to Antioch; and they united in writing a letter "to the brethren from among the Gentiles throughout Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." The concurrence of the Church with what these officers had decided or determined, shows their respect for the authority of their officials; and the manner in which "the brethren" were treated by "the apostles and elders," shows their respect for "the Church."

This Church must, at this time, have consisted of several thousand members; hence the necessity of a plurality of elders, especially as they could not all meet in one place and at one time, they having no large temple nor cathedral in which to assemble.

From this passage we infer that it is a part of the official duty of elders to hear and determine, when new questions arise, what the laws of Christ require, as there must be some tribunal to which to refer such cases. It is also evident that their discussions should not be "with closed doors," but in presence of all the Church to which they belong, that all may be edified. Our civil courts are all held with open doors, and the masses are permitted to hear all allegations and proofs, and most generally those who hear concur with the courts, as in this case in Jerusalem. Another thing is evident; namely, that Churches at a distance may refer difficult questions, or such as they may deem such, to the elders of a distant Church for decision.

There is nothing said relative to the appointment of the elders, nor is there an intimation that they held their office by election. The next mention of elders may settle the question to the satisfaction of all who desire to conform to the Scripture teaching.

Paul and Barnabas, having published the good news to the city of Derbe, "and made many disciples, they turned back to Lystra and Iconium and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must, through much affliction, enter into the Kingdom of God. And having *appointed for them* elders in every Church, they commended them, with prayer and fasting, to the Lord on whom they believed." (Acts xiv, 21, 22, 23.)

There is nothing said here as to the authority of elders; but the passage is conclusive in favor of *appointment*, and against election, by these Churches. The expression, (χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους) "and having appointed *for them* elders," shows conclusively that, although these officers in the Churches of Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, were designed for the benefit of the disciples in these places, yet they were not elected by them, but *appointed for them*.

The expression, "they *turned back* to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch," suggests the idea that they had been in these cities before. And such is the fact; and they had made many disciples in them, but left them without elderships. And knowing that they required such officers, and that they were to be made, not by election, but by appointment, they returned and made appointments for each Church in each of these cities. When it was proper for Churches to select persons, as in the case of receiving and disbursing moneys contributed by the members of the Churches, they were required to make their own selections, observing the requisite qualifications. (Acts vi, 3; 2 Cor. viii, 19.) But there is no case given of their selecting ministers, sometimes called deacons, elders, or bishops.

In the case of the decrees of the Council in Jerusalem, though the apostles and elders allowed "the brethren" to unite in the letter written; yet when the decision, which was submitted to "the apostles and elders," is subsequently referred to, they are called "the decrees that were *ordained by the apostles and elders* who were in Jerusalem," no reference being made to "the brethren" who joined in signing the letter which contained the decrees. (Acts xvi, 4.)

We have before referred to the case of the elders of Ephesus, for the purpose of showing that elder and bishop were two names for the same officer. We turn to it again, for another purpose. "Take heed, therefore, to yourselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit made you [bishops] overseers, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departure grievous wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock. And from among yourselves will men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, remembering that for the space of three years, night and day, I ceased not to warn every one with tears." (Acts xx, 28-31.) The verb *προσέχετε*, here used in the absolute sense, unquestionably means, *be attentive to*. The elders are commanded to be attentive to *themselves* and to *all the flock*; and to (*ποιμαίνειν*) *take care of* the Church of the Lord—to *feed, cherish, provide for, and direct* it. This last verb means much more than barely to feed. It embraces all that a *herdsman* should do for the good of his *flock*. The relationship, then, between elders, or bishops, and the Church is similar to that between a flock and a herdsman. The reason for requiring them to be attentive to themselves and all the flock, to take care of the Church, is given in these words: "For I know this, that after my departure grievous wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock;" "Men will arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

We have already considered 1 Tim. v, 17: "Let the elders who (*καλῶς προσηγορεύουσιν*) *rule well* be counted worthy of double honor." *Preside well* is a good rendering, provided that to *preside* is understood to mean "*to occupy the place of a ruler or director*."

"The elders among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: tend the flock of God which is among you, (*ἐπισκοποῦντες*) *overseeing* it, not by constraint, but willingly, not for base gain, but with good will; neither as being lords over the heritage, but being examples to the flock." (1 Peter v, 3.) This passage proves that elders and bishops are the same officer, in the New Testament sense, as their duty in tending the flock consisted in *overseeing* it; that is, in *superintending* it. The authority of these officers is that of *superintendence, oversight* for the purpose of

direction, and not that of lordship, which often means nothing more nor less than ownership. They were not to think the flock their own. It was "the flock of God," and they were his superintendents, and must oversee in such a manner that when the Chief Shepherd is manifested, they may "receive the unfading crown of glory."

The authority of elders may be farther ascertained by considering Hebrews xiii, 17: "Obey those who are your leaders, and submit yourselves." Their (τοῖς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν) *leaders* were those who had spoken the Word of God to them, precisely what their overseer did; for they were required to be "apt in teaching." The (ἡγεμῶν) *leader* in civil matters was a Roman provincial governor, not a sovereign; not a lawmaker, but an executive officer. The disciples were required to "remember" them as those who spoke the Word of God to them (verse 7), to obey them (verse 17), and to salute all such (verse 24.)

There is another class of officers called (διακονοὶ) *ministers*—improperly, deacons. This noun occurs with the genitive of persons *for whom one ministers*; thus (διακονοῦς τοῦ Θεοῦ) *minister of God*, (τοῦ Χριστοῦ) *of Christ*, (τῆς ἐκκλησίας) *of the Church*, (περιτομῆς) *of the circumcision*, that is, of the Jews. "Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers through whom you believed?" Not deacons through whom they believed, but teachers or ministers of the Gospel. In this sense Paul and Apollos were ministers—the apostles generally were ministers—and their service is called (διακονία) *a ministry*, in an official sense. Peter, speaking of Judas, says, "But he was numbered with us, and obtained *the office of this ministry*." (Acts i, 17.) They prayed that the Lord would show which of the two selected might "take part in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas, by transgression, fell away." (Verse 25.) This is called "the ministry of the word." (Chap. vi, 4.) Paul speaks of his office as "the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify of the good news of the grace of God." (Chap. xx, 24.) He, after embracing the elders of Jerusalem, "recounted particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles through his ministry." (Chap. xxi, 19.) He says (Rom. xi, 13), "Inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify (τὴν διακονίαν μου) *my ministry*." He speaks of this ministry as consisting in "the manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." (2 Cor. iv, 1, 2.) "All things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through

Christ, and gave to us the ministry of (τῆς καταλλαγῆς) the reconciliation." (Chap. v, 18.) He says that he and Timothy gave "no cause of offense in any thing that the ministry be not blamed, but as God's ministers" they "commended themselves in every thing." (Chap. vi, 3, 4) "The ministry" included apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. "And he gave some as apostles, some as prophets, some as evangelists, some as pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry," etc. (Eph. iv, 12.) "And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou didst receive in the Lord, that thou fulfill it." (Col. iv, 17.) "And I thank Him who gave me strength, Christ Jesus our Lord, that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry." (1 Tim. i, 12.) "But be thou watchful in all things, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fully accomplish thy ministry." (2 Tim. iv, 5.)

On these passages we remark, that the words *ministry* and *minister* have a general application to all the authorized teachers in the New Testament. That apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers include the whole. We have seen that bishops and elders are the same, and that pastor is the equivalent of each of them; for the care of a flock, which is the business of a pastor, is regarded as the proper business of bishops and elders. These words, *ministry* and *minister*, are not confined to those classes, but are used of other service and servants, about which we are not now concerned.

But there is a class mentioned in 1 Tim. iii, 8-12, to which the word (διδάσκοντες) *ministers* is in that place restricted, and which is there distinguished from the bishops or overseers. Their qualifications are distinctly mentioned, and it is said that they who have served well as ministers obtain for themselves a good (βαθμός) *bathmos*. This word (from βαίνω, *to step*), having an allusion to a flight of stairs, longer or shorter, means *a step*, or *a degree*, *a grade*, in the sense of ascent in dignity. Before they can be permitted to serve as ministers, the law says, "Let these also first be tested," or proved. Besides their moral qualifications, they are required to be men of families and of good family government, like the bishops. (1 Tim. iii, 12.) A minister may be a novice or a new convert, but an overseer can not. By good services after trial and experience, the minister may obtain the degree of overseer. But he must be tested first as to his moral character, purity of conscience, and family government.

The evangelists constitute another class of officers, the duties and qualifications of which are to be learned by a faithful and thorough study of the Letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus. It is their duty, among other matters, to put things in order in the Churches, and to appoint elders; and if any accusation is made against an elder, it must be before two or three witnesses; and if they have sinned, they must rebuke them openly or "before all, that the rest also may fear." (Tim. v, 19, 20.)

I do not desire to be understood, when I speak of elders, overseers, evangelists, or ministers, and of their authority, to refer to those who are now called by these names. I never have seen many who are called elders or overseers who are qualified for their office. Most of them have been appointed without regard to the Scripture qualifications. Brethren have thought that they must have these officers, and a plurality of them in every little assembly of disciples all over the country, or they can hardly be regarded as in conformity with the laws of Christ. They, therefore, if they have no men who have all the qualifications mentioned by the apostle, elect "those who come the nearest to it." This has led to an eldership, to the government of whom no sensible men will submit, and has a strong tendency to prejudice brethren against the authority of such overseers as are authorized to govern Churches. By *govern*, we do not mean to make laws for, but to see that the laws or commands of our King are executed.

In conclusion, then, let us say, that in each city there was but one Church in the primitive times, however numerous the disciples may have been in it; that for the management of each Church, in the absence of the apostles, an eldership composed of suitable disciples was appointed, some by apostles and some by evangelists, in pursuance and in the absence of apostles, "in every city;" that no bishop or elder had any authority out of his own city; that the elders of each city were the leaders of the Church in that city, and that they had the control and were to be obeyed by the Church; that if any of these men sinned, they were to be "rebuked before all, by the evangelist of that district, that others also might fear; that evangelists were to preach, organize Churches, appoint their officers, and look after the interests of all the Churches in their district, be they many or few; that these evangelists must learn

their duties in full from the Letters to Timothy and Titus; that ministers, as a class distinct from elders, may, by diligent and faithful attention to their ministerial duties, purchase to themselves the good degree of elder; that their ministry may be regarded as a primary *step* to the office of overseer; that it is the duty of evangelists to instruct men with special reference to both these offices, and also to the office of evangelists—to commit what they have received to “faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also;” that a “Universal Bishop” is to be found only in an apostasy (a bishop of a whole state, who can only make an annual visitation, is not an officer of the Church of God); that such an officer can not, with any propriety, be called an overseer; that when all parties will abandon all party feeling and all denominationalism, and return to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, there will be but one Church in Boston, one in New York, one in Philadelphia, one in Baltimore, one in Washington, one in New Orleans, one in Nashville, one in St. Louis, one in Louisville, one in Cincinnati, one in Cleveland, one in Chicago, and so of all the cities in the land.

With all the talent of all the pastors in a given city combined in one grand and continued effort in a series of meetings during the season for holding evening meetings, first at one place of worship and then at another, till all had their turns, more would be accomplished in one year than will be effected in many years to come in the course pursued now.

Let the outside world understand that, with all the places of worship in a city, there was but one Church—the Church of God—and that the pastors were not “ministers of different denominations,” but brothers in the same Church, all laboring to build up the “one body,” then skepticism, infidelity, and spiritualism would dwindle and die. This would also be the grandest “temperance movement” ever inaugurated, and a better “act against vice and immorality” than was ever passed by any legislature.

If the jails were not tenantless, under such a “reign of grace,” their occupants would be few, and the calendars of our courts would be much abridged, for “brother would not go to law with brother,” but their eldership or presbytery would settle all matters of difference among the members.

Evangelists presiding over cities or districts, as the Island of

Crete, would be busy in going from place to place, consulting with elders, ministers, and members, relative to the internal condition of each Church and the general good, while they would at the same time have a class of students fresh from college, it might be, whom they would be training for the ministry and for the eldership. The brethren would be likely to become "of one heart and of one soul," and there would be a better prospect that there would be "no divisions" among them.

The combination of all the ministers, elders, and evangelists, consisting of what are now called "the ministers of the various denominations" into a great missionary board, with the power to call to their aid any competent brother or brethren not included in these classes, to perform special service at any time and in any capacity which they could fill, would be attended with a success truly astonishing. The missionary cause, instead of being an infirm child, trembling upon weak limbs and crying for bread, would be a Sampson, able to pull up and carry off all the gate-posts of the Philistines.

V.—FÉNELON AND RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

L'Intolérance de Fénelon. Études Historiques d'après des documents pour la plupart inédits. Par O. DOUEN. Paris. Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1872.

Œuvres Choies de Fénelon. 4 Tomes. Paris. Hachette & Cie. 1867.

Histoire des Églises du Désert chez les Protestants depuis la fin du règne de Louis XIV jusqu'à la Révolution Française. Par CHARLES COQUEREL. 2 Tomes. Paris. Cherbuliez et Cie. 1841.

Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, documents historiques inédits et originaux,* xvie, xviii et xix. Siècles. Paris.

Voltaire: Lettres inédites sur la Tolérance, publiées avec un' Introduction et des Notes. Par ATHANASE COQUEREL, fils. Paris: J. Cherbuliez. 1863.

Jean Calas et Sa Famille. Étude historique d'après les documents originaux, suivies des pièces justificatives, etc. Par ATHANASE COQUEREL, fils. Seconde édition. Paris: J. Cherbuliez. 1869.

Fénelon: der Schwan von Cambray; ein Lebensbild aus der Gallicanischen Kirche. Von Dr. C. A. WILKINS. Protestantische Kirchenzeitung. 1857.

THE history of the persecutions of Protestants in France, during the reign of Louis XIV, is the blackest page in the annals of modern times. Since the close of the absolute, unlimited dominion of Papal Rome, and especially since the period of the Reformation, no parallel to it can be found in atrocity and extent in the entire limits of the Christian world. During the same period, persecutions occurred in every Catholic country; but every thing of the kind pales in the presence of the wholesale work in France, instigated and urged on to the last by the fanaticism of Madame de Maintenon, the king's secret wife, and the two Jesuits, Père la Chaise, his confessor, and the Chancellor Le Tellier, supported by the body of the Catholic clergy of France.

The edict of toleration, called the Edict of Nantes, given by Henry IV in 1598, had granted to the Protestants a considerable degree of religious freedom, far inferior however to that enjoyed by

* This monthly bulletin has been published since 1853. This Society has been collecting unpublished documents bearing on the history of French Protestantism from France and other lands, and publishes them in the *Bulletin*. A vast amount of new materials is thus gathered for a better understanding and writing of the history of Protestantism in France.

the Catholic religion, which continued to be recognized by the State as the dominant and only true religion. This edict, maintained by Henry IV during his reign, was always endured with bitter, ill-suppressed hostility by the Catholic clergy of France; and when the dagger of the Jesuit Ravaillac, in 1610, struck the king to the heart, it reached the life also of the edict of toleration.

Louis XIII and his ministers, Richelieu and Mazarin, gave but a very partial and unwilling support to this act. The peace the Huguenots enjoyed to the accession of Louis XIV was far from what *we* now understand by religious freedom, or even an honest fulfillment of the Edict of Nantes, imperfect as this was.

Louis XIV, from the beginning, looked with a hostile eye on his Huguenot subjects. In the "Memoirs," written by his own hand as a guide for the dauphin, the heir to the throne, he declares "that he had always regarded his subjects of the Pretended Reformed Religion with grief, as an evil, and therefore had adopted his plans against them, which, as by God's guidance they had been blessed by many conversions, he could not regard as bad." He declares that, while he is disposed to concede what his predecessors had conceded, he would not go in the least beyond that, and would manifest in every way his disapprobation of the false religion and its confessors, and favor the true in all his acts. In this spirit he acted during the first part of his reign, turning his hand against his Huguenot subjects, and harassing them continually by his commissions sent to settle disputes between them and Catholics, and always in favor of the latter.

Royal displeasure in that day meant something, and made itself felt in a thousand ways. The menial servants of the king, with servile, ready dispositions, acted in the spirit of their master, and executed his "royal wishes" even far beyond their intent. Yet he was constrained to acknowledge the loyalty and faithfulness of these objects of his displeasure, as he did in a public decree.

All this time, while the act of Nantes was nominally still in force, Catholic fanaticism was diligently at work to compass its final abolition. Constant acts of intolerance and oppression foreshadowed what was coming. Ordinance after ordinance of the most rigorous nature was issued from Versailles, breaking down, one by one, all the privileges that had been granted. The *dragonnades*, that played

afterward so conspicuous and terrible a part in the persecution of the Huguenots, were set on foot before the Revocation. In October, 1685, the famous act of toleration of Henry IV was finally revoked, and with it every protection was taken from the Protestants, and they were left completely at the mercy of their savage enemies.

The pretense for the Revocation was, that there were no longer any Protestants in France, all of the Pretended Reformed Religion* "having returned to the bosom of the true Church," and therefore the Edict of Nantes was no longer necessary. The enormity of this falsehood and hypocrisy, shared in by the clergy and the court, especially the former, who, together with the servile courtiers, kept continually repeating this to the king, was known to every intelligent man in France, and, of course, is well known to-day. The preamble of the Act of Revocation declares, as a fact, "that the best and the greatest part of the subjects of the king of the Pretended Reformed Religion had embraced the Catholic religion!" In 1700, the intendant of Saintonge complained that in that diocese alone there were sixty thousand heretics; and immediately upon the Revocation, dragoons and missionaries in great numbers were sent out in all directions "to *convert* the heretics!" Not the least odious and wicked feature of this act was this lying and hypocritical pretense set up by the fanatics who were thirsting for the blood of the Protestants. The Act of Revocation ordained the demolition of all Protestant houses of worship; forbade assemblies in any place whatsoever; ordered all ministers not converted, to leave France, on pain of the galleys; commanded that Protestant children be educated as Catholics, and enjoined on the parents to send them to the Churches. Finally, it pronounced definitively the confiscation of goods of all those Protestants who did not enter the Church within four months, and forbade any one to leave the kingdom under pain of the galleys for the men, and the "confiscation of body and goods" for the women; that is, besides the loss of all property, these were to be shut up in convents, or other places of imprisonment. It added, that "any that remained in France not converted should be tolerated on condition of holding no religious exercises or assemblies, or practices of prayer or worship, of the said religion." Edict after edict followed this in

* This was the title by which the Reformed Religion was designated, officially and generally, by Catholics.

quick succession, one more restrictive and cruel than the other, and so numerous that it is impossible to give even a meagre abstract of them here. All, however, were inspired by the same intolerant fury, that, like all the infernal passions of men, once let loose, blazed up into greater and greater violence.

Let us now see how this extreme act of intolerance was regarded and received in France, not by the degraded masses, but in the ranks of intelligence and culture ; for this fact has a direct bearing on our question.

When Le Tellier, the royal chancellor—to whom and to his son Louvois, the minister, and Père La Chaise, the royal confessor, together with Madame Maintenon, this act is largely to be attributed—signed and put the royal seal to this act, he repeated with joy the words of Simeon, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for I have seen thy salvation." Bossuet, Fléchier, La Chaise, Le Tellier ; the body of the French clergy, with Pope Innocent XII ; the brilliant lights of literature ; such men as Racine, Boileau, La Fontaine, La Bruyère, Corneille, Fontenelle, etc.,—all united, not only in countenancing, but in extolling this extreme act of persecution of a king against his own innocent subjects. The French Academy—all the members concurring—forgetting that it owed its very existence largely to Protestants, offered as the subject for the prize of poetry, "*The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*," and Fontenelle carried off the prize. The Abbé Colbert, at the head of the French clergy, pronounced a discourse of thanks to the king for the Revocation. Madame de Sévigné, the elegant court gossip, writing from the court, but six days after the Revocation, to the Count de Bussy, says : "The dragoons have been very good missionaries thus far. The preachers which are now sent will perfect the work. You have no doubt seen the edict by which the king revokes that of Nantes. There is nothing so beautiful as all it contains, and no king has ever done, or ever will do, any thing more honorable." And a few days later to the President de Moulceau : "Every thing is missionary at present. Every one thinks he has a mission, and especially the magistrates and governors of the provinces, supported by some dragoons. It is the greatest and finest thing that has ever been imagined and executed." And this was but the echo of the almost universal sentiment. Some few men there were in France, not

among the clergy, but men like Vauban, who judged the king's conduct and these terrible persecutions as "ill-timed, dangerous, cruel;" but none denied the absolute right of the king in thus exercising his authority. The principle of intolerance was universally conceded, only the barbarous execution was disapproved of by some.

Were we disposed, and did space allow to go into details here, we could fill pages with the declarations and acts of men to show the universal approbation of the principle, and the almost universal approbation of the acts of intolerance. Whoever admits the *principle*, is the author and friend of intolerance in practice, and responsible for it.

The Revocation, in its execution, furnishes the blackest page in the history of the last two centuries. To let loose such an edict in the France of that day, with such a court as Fénelon himself has described, with such a clergy, such a soldiery, such a general condition of things, indicated by the fact of such an edict itself (note the words of Madame Sévigné, above cited), could have had no other results than what we see in the actual history of its execution. This bloody page we need not read in the language of the Protestants. Catholics themselves have written it truthfully enough for us. The Duke de Saint Simon, in his "Memoires," with a master-hand, has traced the terrible picture :

"We can not recall too much," says the author of the "Notice sur Fénelon,"* himself a Catholic, "this great page of a contemporary, a man of a strict religious devotion, and who heard around him (he was eight years old in 1685) the echo of the adulations by which the bishops, the courtiers, and even the poets, had hailed the rigorous decrees of Louis XIV. 'The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes,' says Saint Simon, 'without the slightest justification, and without any necessity, and the many proscriptions which followed, were the fruits of that terrible plot that depopulated a fourth part of the kingdom; which ruined its commerce; which enfeebled it in all its parts; which gave it up so long to the public and avowed pillage of the dragoons; which authorized the tortures and executions by which so many thousands of innocent persons of every sex were actually put to death; which ruined a people so numerous; which destroyed a world of families; which armed relatives against relatives to get hold of their property and let them die of hunger; which drove our manufactories into other lands, made their States flourish and grow rich at the expense of ours, and built among them new cities and towns; which presented to the world the spectacle of so mighty a people proscribed, naked, fugitives, wanderers over the earth without crime, seeking for an asylum far from their native land; which chained nobles (the rich; old men; men often highly esteemed for their piety, their learning, their virtue; men reared in ease; the feeble, the delicate) to the oar, and under the cruel whip of the overseer of the galleys, for no cause but that of religion; which finally, to crown all these

* Sketch of his life in the first volume of "Œuvres Choiesies de Fénelon."

horrors, filled all the provinces of the kingdom with the perjured and sacrilegious, where every thing resounded with the wailings of these unfortunate victims of error; while many others sacrificed their consciences to their property and their peace, both of which they purchased by pretended abjurations, from which they were at once dragged to adore that in which they did not believe, and to receive the divine body of the Most Holy One, while they were yet persuaded that they ate only bread, and which they did with abhorrence. This was the general abomination brought into being by flattery and cruelty. From the torture to abjuration, and from this to the communion, was all often within the space of twenty-four hours."*

Nothing need be added to this picture, although it is not in the least overdrawn. Contemporary Protestant writers have also described to us this history of horrors, but no language can equal the reality. To understand why Saint Simon, an earnest, devout Catholic, born ere the dreadful tragedy had closed, should thus speak of it, it must be noted that the very horror of these awful years had produced an inevitable reaction in the better part of the public mind, by the time Saint Simon wrote, in the second decade of the eighteenth century. "The reaction was so prompt," says the author of the "Notice," "that the regent (successor of Louis XIV), in 1716, seriously thought of recalling the Huguenots from their exile." This reaction, however, was not affected through the clergy, nor among them, but through the influence of the men of letters and among the better classes outside of the priesthood. "When Voltaire and the encyclopædists were struggling against intolerance, they had on their side the sentiment of the whole society of letters, of the bourgeoisie, of the majority of the parliaments, and of a notable part of the aristocracy,"† but not of the clergy. This was in the middle of the last century. The French Revolution gave the mortal blow to the old reign of Catholic intolerance in France.

FÉNELON.

And now, when, in the midst of this universal consent to the principle of intolerance, in the midst of this general eager encouragement, by word and deed, of the royal acts against the Protestants, by the clergy, statesmen, magistrates, scholars, and soldiers, we seek over the wide waste for any exceptions among the great dominant majority to this infernal delirium, we are pointed to Fénelon as the one pure, bright star in the depth of this darkness, as the one man

* "Memoires de Saint Simon," l. 13, page 24.

† "Notice," page 10.

of high position who did not bow his knees to Baal; who had not, in head, in heart or hand, consented to this great crime; and his name is lifted up on high, as an illustrious example of enlightened, perfect Christian tolerance. Catholic writers of the later age, when intolerance had become a deep reproach, have exhausted their rhetoric in praise of Fénelon's tolerance. They call him "the gentlest of prelates," "the sweetest of men," "the apostle of tolerance," and even Protestants like Herder, in his "Adrastea," (page 26), and Ch. Coquerel, in his "Églises du Désert,"* have given him the same praise. Does the impartial testimony of history sustain this judgment? This is the question we propose to consider.

At the very first view of the circumstances, if what Fénelon's panegyrists claim for him on the score of free religious toleration be true, it is a most extraordinary fact, contrary to all probability. That such a prominent, pure example of tolerance should have existed in the midst of the universal consent to intolerance, would be in itself strange enough. But when we consider other facts, that Fénelon was a Catholic priest and an archbishop, a prelate and prince of the Church; that he was the superior, for many years, of the *Nouvelles Catholiques* and of the *Madeleine du Traisnel*, establishments for Protestant ladies and girls, who, according to the lying jargon of the times, "were either new converts or desired to become such," but who had really been taken to these "houses" generally by force and actual arrest, and there detained often as prisoners under severe constraint; that he accepted an appointment and operated as missionary under the Edict and amid the direst scenes of the Revocation, and that, too, in company with Jesuits and dragoons; that he was appointed to these places by the persecuting king who knew and tolerated no religious freedom, whose cruel decrees, general and special, against the Protestants, in the meanwhile, and in the very direction in which Fénelon's activities lay, were ceaselessly launched forth day after day; that his appointments to these places were procured by the bitterest enemies of the Protestants, the very instigators of the Revocation and the cruel edicts and orders that accompanied and followed it;† that Fénelon was himself an extreme

* Tome I, page 66.

† "Fénelon owed his appointments, especially as missionary, chiefly to the influence of Madme de Maintenon and the Jesuit Père la Chaise, the king's confessor. The Duchess of Orleans was the noblest and purest, as well as the bravest, woman at the French court.

Ultramontanist, and that his praises are sung by the Jesuits,—when we consider all these well-known facts alone, before even entering into a closer examination of Fénelon's history and sentiments, surely we can not but listen with extreme distrust to the story that "Fénelon was the very apostle of toleration."

M. Douen's book has led us to a more extended and thorough study of the facts in Fénelon's life and of his writings, as they bear on the question of religious toleration; and we have been brought to a certain conclusion that, whatever undeniable merits attach to the character and life of the "Swan of Cambray," his claim to religious toleration, in any right sense of this term, is wholly unfounded. This conclusion we propose to make good in these pages.

Before we go into the more special examination of Fénelon's position on freedom of conscience and worship, let us record more fully the declarations of history as to the general sentiment, on this subject, of the period in which he lived.

In speaking of the reaction that followed the persecutions of Louis XIV, the author of the "Notice sur Fénelon" says:

"It revealed itself very soon, *not upon the principle* [of intolerance] *which every body adopted*, but upon the barbarous execution. Many bishops approved every thing, even violence. Bossuet and the Gallican bishops could the less call

She was the daughter of the Elector of the Palatinate—a German Protestant princess, and "converted" only at the will of her ambitious father, for the sake of her marriage with the king's brother. She always retained her free, brave German Protestant spirit. The whole court, especially the miserable women in it, stood in salutary fear of this grand woman. The king himself allowed her perfect freedom. She abhorred the licentiousness, the religious superstition, hypocrisy, and cant, and the intolerance all around her. In her correspondence she thus speaks of Madame de Maintenon and Père la Chaise, the former of whom she constantly delights, in the exuberance of her contempt, to call "the old woman," and by even a worse name, in French, "*la guenipe*."

"The old woman and the Jesuits have persuaded the king that, if he will persecute the Protestants, he will thus efface, before God and before the world, the scandal of the double adultery in which he lives with Madame de Montespan. Before the old *guenipe* ruled here, religion in France was very reasonable; but she has spoiled every thing, and has introduced all sorts of silly devotions, as the rosaries, etc.; and when people want to show themselves reasonable, the old woman and the confessor have them thrown into prison or exiled. These two are the cause of all the persecutions which have been directed in France against the poor Reformed and the Lutherans. This Jesuit with long ears, Father la Chaise, has commenced this work, together with the old *guenipe*, and Father le Tellier has carried it through. It is by this that France has been ruined." (Bulletin, Vol. IV, page 531.)

Now, it was precisely the "old *guenipe*," Father la Chaise and Father le Tellier, the Jesuits, that were Fénelon's friends at court, especially the "old woman;" the king called Fénelon "her man." (See near the conclusion of this article.) What Robespierre, Marat, and Danton were to the reign of terror, this bloody trio were to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

in doubt the right of the king, since they invoked the civil authority, *not only as all the Catholics of this period*, for the execution of the Pontifical decrees, the laws and canons of the Church, but for the very effective control of the Bulls and other acts emanating from the Court of Rome." (Page 10.)

Gallicans and Ultramontanists, differing in the premises and mode of reasoning, both came substantially and practically to the same conclusion—the right to *enforce* obedience to the Church. The latter held the Church supreme, and the State as its servant, bound to execute its decrees, but not in any way to rule it. What right have we to except Fénelon from this general statement? Can we suppose that such a decided Ultramontanist as Fénelon was, would be in advance of the Gallicans in the matter of religious freedom? Is this the testimony of history, a logical conclusion from the premises?

But let us now first inquire into Fénelon's views on religious toleration. What were these? We have no difficulty whatever in arriving at a clear knowledge here, as his writings and acts furnish us abundant testimonies on this point.

Fénelon was an Ultramontanist, as we have said. The Ultramontane doctrine runs through all his teachings in ecclesiastical and political matters, and he has written much on both these subjects. No one, not the Pope himself, has maintained in clearer language the absolute freedom of the Church from all State control.

"The world, in submitting itself to the Church, has not acquired the right of subjecting it. Princes, in becoming the children of the Church, have not become its masters: their duty is to 'serve it,' and not to rule it; to 'kiss the dust of its feet,' and not to impose a yoke upon it." "If the Church accepts the precious and munificent gifts which princes give to it, it is not because it wishes to renounce the Cross of its Spouse, and to enjoy deceitful riches; it only wants to give to princes the merit of despoiling themselves of these." "Rather than accept the yoke of the powers of this world, and to lose the freedom of the Gospel, it would give back the temporal gifts it has received of princes."

So much for the freedom of the Church. The service princes must render to the Church is thus declared in the boldest Ultramontane style in the same connection:

"Not only can princes do nothing against the Church, but they can also do nothing for it touching the spiritual, except in obeying it. It is true that the pious and zealous prince is called 'the bishop without' and 'the protector of the canons,' expressions we repeat without ceasing, with joy, in the moderate sense in which the ancients used them. But the 'outside bishop' must never undertake the function of him that is within. He stands with sword in hand at the door of the sanctuary, but he takes care not to enter it. At the same time that he

protects, he obeys; he protects the decisions, but he does not make any. The two functions to which he limits himself are these: The first, to maintain the Church in its perfect freedom against its enemies from without, in order that it may, without any hinderance, pronounce, decide, approve, correct, and, finally, cast down all that opposes itself to the knowledge of God. The second is, to support these same decisions, after they are made, without allowing himself, under any pretext whatever, to interpret them. This protection of the canons turns itself only against the enemies of the Church; that is, against the innovators, against the indocile and contagious spirits, against all who refuse the correction. He not only obeys himself, but he makes others obey by his example, and by the power which he holds in his hands. Whatever need the Church has for a prompt aid against heresies and against abuses, she has still more need of preserving its liberty.*

The sentiments here expressed, utterly at variance with all ideas of free toleration, are in harmony with Fénelon's doctrines in all his writings on the power of the Church and its relations to the State, and are of the most decided Ultramontane type.

"He was an Ultramontanist. The liberties of the Gallican Church were, in his eyes, liberties in relation to the Pope, servitude [toward] to the king." "It is an abuse," said he, "to allow the Pope to meddle with temporal affairs; and it is an abuse to demand that laymen should examine and discuss the Bulls on the faith." "He admitted the religion of the State, and the absolute power of the king by divine right. He was not satisfied with the privileges granted to the clergy by the French Constitution, and which were, 1st, to be the first order of the State; and, 2d, to sit with deliberative voice in the Estates General when it pleased the king to convoke them. He demanded that all the bishops should be, by right, members of all political bodies of all degrees, and that some of them should always be in the council of the king."†

He was also a very zealous partisan of the rights of the nobility.

The sentiments here attributed to Fénelon, and those quoted above from his "Sermon," are fully and formally developed in his "Plan of Government to be Proposed to the Duke de Bourgogne," written in 1711.‡ The ecclesiastical and political doctrines of Fénelon leave, in consistency, absolutely no room for toleration, as any one can clearly see. And these doctrines were not held in an inactive way, as mere ideas. This, with him, could not possibly be the case. He was placed too high. As archbishop, he was also titular Duke of Cambray and a Seigneur of the realm; and he was too much involved in Church and State matters to hold his views in a quiet, innocent way. Neither was it his disposition to do this; he

* Sermon at the Consecration of the Elector of Cologne as Bishop. "*Œuvres Choiesies*," Vol. IV, pp. 5-7.

† "Notice," page 47.

‡ "*Œuvres Choiesies*," T. IV, page 399, *et seq.*

loved authority and influence. His extreme Ultramontanism explains his profound, complete, and ready submission to the Papal decree against him. He gave this ready, absolute submission as, according to his own creed, due from him to the voice of St. Peter; and as he yielded it himself, *so, in like manner, he demanded it from every one else* under Papal control, embracing all professing Christians—Catholics, and *the rebel children, the Protestants*. His exposition of this as his doctrine, in precept and practice, is the completest possible. Herein is the directing power of his whole public life.

His doctrine on this subject coincides to the full extent with that of the Popes of Rome, and precisely that held, taught, and so persistently persevered in by Pius IX to-day, and formulated and proclaimed in his Bulls, the Syllabus, and Brief, and fixed, finally, by the several decrees of the late Vatican Council. The reader must have been struck with the exact coincidence between the passages we have quoted from the "Consecration Sermon" and the language we have heard from the present Pope. A fuller comparison of Pius and his Council with Fénelon makes this coincidence still more complete and striking.

Now, if Pius IX is an apostle of toleration—and who will so call him?—then is Fénelon. Fénelon never said sweeter and gentler things, nor pleasanter words about liberty of conscience, than the present Pope; and *Pius never did more intolerant things than Fénelon*, nor perhaps as many. This will be perfectly clear, we trust, ere we close this article.

Right here, to enforce what we have just said, we may quote a passage from the "Notice," showing that our appreciation on this point is just; and, remember, this author does his best to eulogize his hero:

"It was the fashion of the last century to regard Fénelon as a liberal spirit; he was only a *generous* one. He believed that the people had a right to be governed justly, as the poor have the right of being helped; but he did not admit that the absolute power of kings could be contested. This was to him the first political dogma. It is possible that in some Christian sentiment he may have said that the people were not made for kings, but kings for the people. It was a maxim piously proposed to the virtue of princes, which is to take nothing away from their divine right. The Popes have also proclaimed this maxim, without yielding any thing of their power, when they write at the head of their apostolic briefs the title of 'servant of the servants of God.' In the eyes of Fénelon, the royal power was a sort of temporal priesthood, limited only by the rights of religion and morality. It is probable that he would have rejected the idea of a *Charter of Rights* granted by

kings, as a sort of sacrilege, because this kind of concessions, even while they declare the absolute power, limit it. The liberalism claimed for him was only, in his eyes, a more regular and more humane method of exercising absolute power."

"So, likewise, is it about the ideas of Fénelon on toleration. He was a most decided and most avowed partisan of the principle of the religion of the State. He most sincerely regarded dissidents as revolted subjects; he believed that the prince had a right to punish them, and he made it his duty. Only he condemned the rigorous exercise of these rights." *

In how far this last remark is true—and there is truth in it—we shall see by and by. This is the truth plainly told, and also the real ground of the error of the last century, which error has created and controlled the false appreciation of Fénelon as an "apostle of toleration," so generally, to our own day. And yet it is strange how such a very mistaken judgment could so long prevail.

We add another passage from the "Notice," showing how a better judgment, to-day, dissipates this error of last century:

"Very zealous for the spiritual independence of the Church, Fénelon did not admit the principle of the liberty of conscience invoked by the Protestants. He strongly approved that the king should not suffer any other religion in his state than the Catholic. He was the first to make known to the minister the fact that many of the Protestants intended to pass into Holland, and demanded of him to have all the passages well guarded. He desired that the authority should show itself inflexible in restraining the spirits, which he said the slightest relaxation rendered insolent. He preferred acts of kindness to rigor, not reflecting that benefits also are a violence; † and as to this rigor itself, whatever has been said to the contrary, he neither constantly nor absolutely proscribed it. 'We must not do them harm,' said he; 'it is enough that they should always feel the hand uplifted to strike them if they resist.' 'We need good schools,' said he again (that is, Catholic schools), 'and we need an authority which never relaxes, in order to oblige all the families to send their children to these.' Thus there is no way of transforming Fénelon, as some have desired to do, into an apostle of liberty of conscience. One day it was published that he had counseled toleration to the dethroned King of England; and at once the venerable Abbé de Fénelon, his grand-nephew, who perished on the scaffold in 1793, after a long and virtuous career, protested against this *calumny*, and proved that the Archbishop of Cambrai had only counseled patience and mildness." ‡

The writer of this "Notice" is a devout Catholic, an ardent admirer of Fénelon, disposed to take the very best view of him, and himself a true friend of toleration. He says:

"The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes is severely judged to-day. Liberty of conscience has entered into our manners; we do not completely practice it; we

* "Notice," pp. 46, 47.

† This refers to Fénelon's proposal to influence the Protestants to become converted by gifts. (See the second part of this article, "Fénelon as a Missionary.")

‡ "Notice," page 12.

do not yet well understand it, but we all admit its principle; it is the foundation of our civil laws, and the Catholics are often the first to appeal to it for themselves."

The deliberate judgment, so fully and so clearly rendered, and based on such good reasons, we think, might be accepted as decisive of our question. But we prefer to look more directly and fully into the grounds of this judgment for ourselves, that we may be able to form our own independent decision.

FÉNELON, SUPERIOR OF THE NOUVELLES CATHOLIQUES AND OF THE MADELEINE DU TRAISNEL.

There had been established at Paris, and at numerous other places in France, houses called, for males, *Les Nouveaux Catholiques*; for females, *Les Nouvelles Catholiques*, for the reception of young Protestants who had—such was the language—"become, or desired to become," Catholics, and "to procure for them salutary retreats against the persecutions of their relatives and against the artifices of heretics."

Such was the precise language of the author of the "Constitutions" or "Regulations" for the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, at Paris. There is, of course, not the slightest difficulty in understanding the nature and object of such institutions, especially at that time, and in France. The real object of these retreats is evident from a passage in the "Rules and Constitutions:"

"With reference to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, they must be received with great readiness, but they must be treated with more charity, especially in the beginning. Wives may be received without the consent of their husbands, children without that of their parents, and domestics without that of their masters."

This is putting them, as was usual with such establishments, above the laws of the State. Again:

"When the new converts commit some error, they must be advised with much kindness [always this ominous *douceur*]; if they continue in their error, they must be reprov'd with charity; if they persist in their disobedience, the lady superior shall impose on them penitences in proportion to their weakness; if they become incorrigible, their safe-keeping shall be provided for."

This "safe-keeping," as the general history of these institutions shows, and as we shall soon see, simply meant their *imprisonment*.

These extracts from the "Regulations" of these institutions are expressed, of course, in very mild words, but their meaning makes us shudder. Let us now look more narrowly into the character and

history of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*. This institution was an object of special attention to the king and the fanatical Madame de Maintenon. His majesty supplied, by "subventions," funds for its support. While Fénelon was its superior, the king, "wishing to favor the establishment," presented to it "the cemetery which they of the Pretended Reformed Religion had in the suburb of Saint Marcel, and the buildings erected on it;" that is, he enriched this pious institution with property robbed from the Protestants. Let us see, now, who were the inmates of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, how they came there, and how they were treated.

The institution was designed for "new female converts, or those who desired to become such," and "as an asylum against the persecution of their relatives." The following "royal orders" are the interpretations of these "charitable" words:

Colbert, Marquis de Seignelay, Secretary of State, writes to the lieutenant-general of police:

"APRIL 24, 1685.

"His majesty desires to have placed into the *Nouveaux* or *Nouvelles Catholiques*, the children of the woman Rousseau, who are under age, in which houses their expenses will be paid by his majesty, after you have informed me what is necessary to be paid. With regard to the others of riper years, his majesty relies on you to induce them, by such means as you think most suitable, to become converted."

Here is a family torn cruelly asunder, the parents robbed of their children. The "woman Rousseau" was an "obstinate Huguenot;" the younger ones carried to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, the older ones to be converted by such means as the chief of police might think fit to adopt! Some years ago, the Mortara case at Rome—a humble Hebrew family, robbed of a child—aroused the world, and excited, without effect, the interference of Governments. Here we have *Mortarism* practiced by rule and on a grand scale! The *Nouvelles Catholiques*, and other similar institutions, were filled, since the middle of the seventeenth century, with these children of every age, torn from Huguenot families. A Protestant writer, Charles Drelincourt, of that period, wrote, "The complaints and the wailings of fathers and mothers resound all over the land, and the cries of these poor children mount to the heavens!" The *Nouvelles Catholiques* played a distinguished part in this infernal crime, with Fénelon as its superior! To rob little children was no less a crime

than to drag the unwilling victims of mature years to these prisons of "charity" and "religion;" it was a greater one.

Another order—always from the same state secretary—to the chief of police:

"OCTOBER 20.

"His majesty desires that you send to Charenton, and bring from there Madeleine Risoul, and that you have her placed in the *Nouvelles Catholiques*."

This was another heretic to be converted by Fénelon. Again:

"JANUARY 24, 1686.

"The king knows that the wife of Trouillon, apothecary at Paris, who is at present with the Duke and Duchess de Bouillon, is one of the most obstinate Huguenots in existence. And as her conversion might bring about that of her husband, his majesty desires *that you have her arrested* and taken to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, according to the order which I here send you."

The words we put in italics show *how* these persons were brought to Fénelon's "retreat from persecutions."

A police agent, named Degrez, unaccustomed to the refined, ingenious language by which priests and courtiers designated these acts, in coarse, rude style, made his reports to La Reynie, the Chief of Police, for these arrests. "Femme, or fille—so and so—arrested prisoner!" This was the naked truth. This business of "arresting" women, and confining them in these "retreats," for the reasons indicated in the above orders, assumed immense proportions at this time. De Seignelay writes to the *procureur-general*:

"JANUARY 5, 1686.

"His majesty has given orders to the Archbishop of Paris to have placed in all suitable houses the women you may send him; and this order holds good, not only as regards Paris, but of all the convents of the diocese."

The Archbishop of Paris furnished blank orders, signed by him, to these police officers, for the above purpose. Under date of April 2, 1686, the *procureur-general* writes to his grace:

"MONSIEUR,—I have only two or three of your orders left for receiving women in the convents; I beg you to be kind enough to send me a dozen. I am, etc."

This was the short, business-like way in which this wholesale work of arresting and confining Huguenots, men, women, and children, was carried on.

TREATMENT IN THE NOUVELLES CATHOLIQUES.

The specimens of orders of arrest we have already given, testify sufficiently to the lying pretenses that the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, and

similar houses of confinement, were "safe and delightful retreats to new converts, or those desiring to become such, from the persecutions of their heretic relatives;" but the details of the history of the *Nouvelles Catholiques* reveal the enormity of the falsehood still more clearly. In the State archives is the following *ordonnance*, dated April 8, 1686:

"BY ORDER OF THE KING.

"His majesty, desiring to procure for the women still professing the so-called Reformed Religion, the means of being instructed, and of accepting the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, has given his orders to receive a number of them into the house of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, at Paris, in which, his majesty is informed, they receive abundant instruction in the duties of said Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion; and since there are some who, refusing to receive the said instructions, remain in a guilty obstinacy, his majesty enjoins the lady superior of the said house to make known to those who are there, and who will hereafter be received there, that his will is that they hear, with submission and patience, the instructions that will be given them, so that, in the time of fifteen days from the day they are received, they may accept the Catholic religion (*faire leur réunion*); and in case they do not do it in the said time, he enjoins to the said lady superior to give notice of it, that his majesty may provide for it as may seem him best.

"Done," etc.

A note accompanying this order, and of the same date, explains it. De Seignelay writes to the lady superior of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*:

"I send you the order *which you asked for*, to oblige the women who were in your house to make them reunite [with the Church] more promptly. Try and make the best use of it you can."

So we see the secret of this order,—*it was asked for* by heads of the house to facilitate conversion. Mother Garnier, the lady superior, was the subaltern of Fénelon in this office, and acted under his direction. Fénelon, as Saint Simon says, had great vanity to be a master *convertisseur*, and it wounded his pride and injured his reputation to have so many recalcitrants in his "retreat" of conversion. These refractory ones were to be hurried to their "reunion" "by order of the king," *at Fénelon's request*.

There are other precious orders ("*de par le roi*") showing the obstinacy (*opiniâtreté*) of these women, and how they were treated.

It must be stated, also, that the *Nouvelles Catholiques* was designed for women and girls of the nobility and of the higher classes mainly. It was supposed that these, accustomed to comfort and

refinement, could easily be conquered, either by the seductions of rhetoric, attractive prospects, or by rigor. Yet the failures were very numerous and very signal.

What these threats in the above orders meant, it is not difficult to understand. In the archives of the State, under date of August 4, 1687, are a series of "*Ordres du Roy*," given at Versailles, among which the following:

"To transfer the demoiselles Dury the elder, Manyer the younger, and Marisette, from the house of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, at Paris, to the *citadelle* of Montreuil;" "To transfer the demoiselles Manyer the younger, Manyer the youngest [with six others named], to the *citadelle* of Montreuil;" "To transfer la dame Cocg [with five others named] to the *citadelle* at Amiens."*

This is the execution of the threat against Lady Cocg, in the order of the king given above. Her husband, *le Sieur Cocg*, was, at the same time, transferred from a convent at Paris, where he was confined to the Castle de Saint Malo. It will also be observed in these orders, that three sisters—Manyer the "oldest, younger, and youngest"—are imprisoned, one at the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, and all three transferred to *citadelles*. In brief, the history of this house, during Fénelon's activity in it as *convertisseur* and administrator, leaving out details, which the reader can readily imagine, is as follows:

"Of the one hundred and twenty-five names known to us [these names are given with details in the Appendice of M. Douen's book], there are thirty-one of whom we know only that they were incarcerated in the *Nouvelles Catholiques*. Of the remaining ninety-four, twenty-five at least, conquered by a long and severe confinement, abjured in the hands of Fénelon; two only after three months, Mesdames Vidal and Martine; one other, in whom Madame Maintenon took a special interest, Mademoiselle Ste. Hermine,† at the end of nine months; Mademoiselle de Villarnouf at the end of two years; a fifth, Catharine de Jaucourt Villarnouf, at the end of six years. Eight at least feigned conversion to regain their liberty, and to escape from France," etc.‡

Some of these were but children, and what a tale the history of these children tells! Hear it:

"The oldest of the Hammaret is very obstinate (*très deraisonnable*). She is only four years old, and yet it is very dangerous to give her the liberty of seeing those who are not yet converted, or who are bad Catholics!"

* "Bulletin," Vol. II, page 345.

† This young lady, of a noble family, was violently abducted and confined in Fénelon's prison. The brave resistance of the young girls of this family to their tormentors, made Madame de Caylus, herself an apostate, write: "The resistance of these young persons was infinitely glorious to Calvinism."

‡ Douen, pp. 81-84.

A child four years old resisting, in a prison, the machinations of Fénelon and his aids! She never yielded, but was, as a hopeless heretic, finally expelled from France. She was of brave parentage. Her mother, wife of an elder of a Church in Paris, was also confined in this prison, after having first been in the Bastille. She was afterward sent from Fénelon's retreat to the *citadelle* of Amiens, and finally, with her husband, expelled from France in 1688.

Another, Mademoiselle de Laure, is thus noticed in the list of 1687, during Fénelon's reign: "Aged eleven years; has not yet communed; can not without danger be sent back to her parents." There is no account that she ever became a hopeful convert.

In this list of Fénelon's prisoners, are three little girls named Mallet, the oldest but twelve years of age. These were kept in the *Nouvelles Catholiques* several years. Under date of February 1, 1687, this brief notice is attached to their names: "Can not without danger be committed back to their parents." *They resisted firmly for nine long years*, while their father and mother, who were in prison, the latter in the Bastille, had been brought to abjure their faith. The mother, however, soon again shook off the yoke assumed in an hour of weakness; she was again imprisoned, in 1701, in the Castle de Pont de l'Arche, and finally transferred to the *Union Chrétienne* at Paris, another of those pious retreats.

God stood by these brave little children; and their cruel tormentors, in the last day, will hear the words, "Whatsoever ye have done to these little ones that believe in me, you have done it unto me!"

While many of the ladies imprisoned for conversion in Fénelon's "retreats," proving too "*opiniâtres*," as he called it (obstinate), were thus removed and sent to various prisons, or exiled from France, others were disposed of in the same way because they could not pay for their keeping; for, we must add, an additional pious feature of these "holy retreats" was, that the parents, husbands, and other relatives or friends of those confined there, *were, by royal decree, obliged to pay for their keeping*. In some cases, the wretched parents, or others, were thus forced to pay large sums. For some, as a mark of special good-will (*bonté*, as Fénelon called it), and of "pious interest," the king paid the expenses, as is seen from some of the orders quoted above. All this was besides the "subventions" to these houses from the royal exchequer.

Of those women who, for the lack of friends to pay for them, were sent to public prisons, the records show that a number were "transferred" to *l'Hôpital General*, a prison for the most infamous and degraded classes. This is a comment on the hypocritical pretense of "Christian charity," "virtue," and the "love of souls," that was continually paraded by these "converters" before the world. Many of the "hopelessly obstinate" were by royal order expelled from France.

The orders for these "transfers" and "expulsions," with details, have been brought forth from the State archives, where they lay buried for two centuries, by the *Society of the History of Protestantism in France*, and published in their "Bulletin." We give a few specimens:

"TO M. DE LA REYNIE, CHIEF OF POLICE.

"JANUARY 18, 1691.

"The king desires that the two women of Madame de la Force, who are at the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, and the one who is at the house of Desgrez, be sent out of the kingdom, by way of Valenciennes. They must leave by the first conveyance. I have written to M. Magaloti to send them to Mons with a trumpeter."

Same date, to M. Magaloti:

"The king desires you to send beyond the kingdom three women obstinate in the Pretended Reformed Religion, and who have not yet been induced (*qu'on n'a pu jusques à present obliger*) to make their reunion."*

These transfers and expulsions were made during the whole period of Fénelon's administration, as well as before and after.

But there is in the history of these martyrs of Fénelon's converting prisons, if possible, a still blacker page.

Madame de la Fresnaye, a noble lady, was arrested and brought to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, January 20, 1686. After she had been four months in the hands of Fénelon, as *convertisseur*, we find the following order sent from the State Secretary Seignelay, to La Reynie, dated May 4th:

"Madame Garnier having written to me that the Lady de la Fresnaye, who is at the *Nouvelles Catholiques* is insane, and that it is necessary to place her in close confinement, the king desires that you examine whether this be true, that you let me know where she can be placed."

Mademoiselle des Forges, a gifted and cultivated young lady, was arrested and confined, at first at the *Benedictines de la Madeleine du*

* "Bulletin," Vol. II, page 563.

Traisnel, of which Fénelon also was superior. Afterward she was placed in the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, and appears there in the list of October 17, 1686. In the list of December following, this note is attached to her name: "Does not want ever to hear of religion." In February following, she is still marked as "Protestant." Finally, Fénelon and his aids succeeded in "converting" her. After she had been made to sign the formula of abjuration, she was sent home insane, the result of what she had endured. Soon after her return to her family, she threw herself from the third story on the pavement; and there lay the palpitating remains of the victim of the converting efforts of "the sweet and gentle Fénelon's retreat." De Beringhen, her relative, writes:

"Every one knows that she was a young lady of intelligence and talents; but the continual severe treatment, forced abstinence, and the loss of sleep she had to endure at the hands of these pitiless creatures, in a very short time made her lose her reason and her life."

It was not French subjects alone, but also foreigners, that were confined in Fénelon's converting houses. Listen, while the horror we have just been describing is still on the soul, to what one of these sweet-tongued Catholic writers says about these foreign prisoners: "There could be seen here women of all the sects and all the countries of Europe—Jewesses, Lutherans, Calvinists. They came from Germany, England, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and other countries of the North, where heresy had made such great ravages;" and then the delightfulness of their abode there is charmingly described.

You would suppose, from these writers, that these women had flown to this happy paradise, as "doves to the windows." But let us penetrate behind the dark veil, and see *how* these foreign women were kept in Fénelon's houses. The State archives tell the story. One order grants permission to a young lady from Holland, named Cerceau, to go outside the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, on condition that her lawyer will answer for her return; another allows a Madame de Berages, from Holland, to go and see her husband, lying sick some leagues from Paris.

But enough. The heart sickens as you move among these scenes of horrible outrages committed by cruel Catholic fanaticism in high places, rioting in unrestrained power on such multitudes of helpless victims; sparing no sex, no age; tearing asunder every tie; respecting

no feeling of the human heart; with cruel foot, trampling on the holiest and most cherished treasures of the soul. All this was but the execution of the infernal rule uttered by Madame de Maintenon, that abominable woman, the protector of Fénelon and guardian of his work as superior of the "retreats," and as missionary in Saintonge. "There is no longer any other means except violence."*

But we have given enough of the history of the *Nouvelles Catholiques* to enable the reader fully to understand the character of these institutions of which Fénelon was the superior from 1678 to 1689—a period that includes the dark years of the Revocation, when the fanaticism of "conversion" was unchained in all its fury. Ten years is a long time, forbidding every thought that the work and character of these two houses was uncongenial to Fénelon. The man who could accept, retain, and actively exercise the superior control of such institutions, or have any willing share in them whatever, has forever forfeited before the world every claim as a friend of religious toleration and of charity, and especially a man of the high intelligence and culture of Fénelon. It is an insult to the reason and the humanity of an enlightened world to propose such a claim!

And now, in full view of this dark picture of Fénelon's history as jailer and *convertisseur*, let us read a passage from his life by the Jesuit, Father Querbœuf. This passage is profitable to us to show what confidence is to be placed in some Catholic writers, and how Jesuitism perverts truth and conscience, and how, by skillful rhetoric, the abominable and hideous can be portrayed in the most attractive colors of light and beauty. We have space to quote but a part of the Jesuit's charming description of Fénelon's paradise:

"Monsieur de Harlay,"† says Querbœuf, "then [1678] Archbishop of Paris, informed of the talents and success of the Abbé de Fénelon, desired to make use of them and extend their sphere; he confided to him the *Nouvelles Catholiques*. It was an association of enlightened young ladies, pious, well-born, who devoted

* In her letter of December 19, 1681, to her brother D'Aubigné.

† We are tempted to give, in a few words, a sketch of this infamous man—licentious, hypocritical, and abominable beyond all expression—not because he is especially worth notice, but because he, as Archbishop of Paris, had most to do with the matters of which we are treating, and his character works into the general web of this history. Lest we should be charged with Protestant illiberality and injustice, we quote from an unexceptionable source—from Fénelon himself—and words written by him to the king, and for which we give Fénelon credit. They were written, of course, after he had got out of Harlay's control: "You have an archbishop, corrupt, scandalous, incorrigible, false, malignant, crafty, the enemy of every virtue, and who fills all good people with grief."

themselves freely, and without selfish motives, to the instruction of Protestant young ladies.

"Louis XIV protected this house, loaded it with favors, and filled it with proselytes. Nothing, therefore, was more important than to give it a head who combined in himself both the gifts of knowledge and, what was still more necessary, the gifts of persuasion; a head skilled in controversy; wise, even indulgent; capable of waiting patiently the moments of light and of grace, of winning hearts by dissipating successfully the clouds that obscure the mind. . . .

"However ordinary, however obscure were the functions of Fénelon, all soon admired the uncommon manner in which he exercised them, and the *Nouvelles Catholiques* became the theater of his glory and of his reputation. His catechetical lessons and his instructions were eagerly visited; every one talked only of his simple, noble, and persuasive eloquence, and of the conversions that were its salutary fruit."*

And so on, in the most silvery strains.

Reader, are you not captivated by the exquisite charm of this attractive picture? And do you not feel as if the real picture we have been studying must be, after all, but a phantom? Do not this Jesuit's idyllic strains transport you, as M. Douen says, to the Isle of Calypso and its happy nymphs, and its scenes of exquisite perpetual delights? Or do you, perhaps, rather feel that this description of Father Querbœuf is a diabolism, clothing in heavenly light the works of infernal darkness? Learn from this, O reader, to understand the language, the rhetoric of the Catholic Church! From many this knowledge is yet concealed, and they believe the gorgeously painted lie to their own ruin.

But the real truth of Fénelon's life and habits, as a controller of institutions and men, has also been seen and described by Catholic, but not by clerical or Jesuit hands. The Duke de Saint Simon, a contemporary in early life of Fénelon, and in whose day the famed convertor's life was yet fresh in the minds of men, draws this portrait of him:

"His persuasion, spoiled by habit, could endure no resistance; he wanted to be believed at the first word. The authority which he exercised was, on the part of his auditors, without reasoning, and his domination without the slightest contradiction. To be oracle, became with him a habit, which even his condemnation and its consequences could not diminish. He wanted to govern as a master who gives a reason to nobody—to rule directly and completely."

M. Nisard says of him:

"This necessity of managing every thing by rule, is the secret desire of riding himself of all contradiction, and of enjoying quietly full dominion. The absolute spirit of Fénelon betrays itself in the dry precision, in the severity of all his

* "*Œuvres Complètes de Fénelon*," Paris, 1822; Vol. I, pp. 18-23.

regulations. He settles every thing by short and laconic articles, and his cold intelligence is pleased with this spectacle of a society which executes all movements with the precision of a machine. The people, for Mentor, are but numbers, not souls. He made use of his friendship for his own power, and perhaps of his virtues to gain favor. And when the spirit of domination—which to the last hour made him desire to enter the State Council—urged him to harsh words against a friend, and were it even the Duke de Beauvilliers, the soul of his soul, says Saint Simon, his hand hesitated not to write them. It seems that Fénelon seeks only a personal success in a debate of doctrine; and if he only saves the credit of his person, his aim is reached.*

We shall next study Fénelon as a missionary in Saintonge, and in other acts of his life.

VI.—"ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY IN THE FIRST AGE."

THE article in the CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY of April last, on the above theme, is styled, in a note by the temporary editor, "*very able*." While we concur in the courtesy of this acknowledgment, we must, however, guard our readers against supposing that we are at all convinced of the soundness of the argument brought out at such length by the ingenious writer. On the contrary, the more the argument is labored, the more are we satisfied that episcopacy has just as little foundation in primitive history as in the Word of God. By *primitive* history, we mean the history of the first two centuries. In thus extending the discussion from the *first* into the *second* century, we give the Episcopalian advocate more than he asks. He boldly challenges debate on the Ecclesiastical Polity of the First Age. While we meet him there, we invite him to extend his examination into all that is surest in the history of the second age, *and even beyond as far as he pleases*. It seems to us the Episcopalian advocate injures his cause by styling Neander, Mosheim, etc., *theorists*, and claiming the facts as on his side. If he can *prove* this, he does every thing; for in an argument on Episcopacy, as on Christianity itself—indeed on any thing else—FACTS must triumph. As we expect to demonstrate, it was simply by forgetting and ignoring *facts*, that episcopacy ever

* *Revue des deux Mondes*, March 15, 1846.

got a foothold in the world, and became the stumbling-block of the latter half of the third and of all succeeding centuries; so that Mr. Froude's declaration, on his late visit to New York, that no men had done so much mischief as bishops, may perhaps be found, on a careful examination, to have had too much foundation in truth.

While our Episcopalian apologist injures his cause by speaking contemptuously of Neander and Mosheim, etc., as "theorists," inasmuch as the reputation of these authors is too high to be affected by a mere anonymous assertion, he tries to carry his point by the usual encomium on the "judicious" Hooker. He unites Bingham in the same eulogy. Hooker's "great work, like Bingham's, stands without a rival and without a successor." "It is safe to say that no man, who has not studied these two authors, is competent to form a reliable opinion on the ecclesiastical polity in the first age of the Church. It is a very easy thing to adopt a whole set of opinions on this subject from some theorist, like Neander or Mosheim or Lyman Coleman; but it is a far safer thing, as well as a far nobler exercise of the understanding, to study the facts for one's self, independently, and then to deduce from them conclusions of one's own."

We have, then, it seems, to meet the shield of Bingham and the spear of Hooker in this encounter; and while we make no pretension of having studied either the one or the other, we are unconscious of the slightest alarm at standing the brunt of these terrible weapons on the strong arm and in the skillful hand of our antagonist.

We begin with the shield of Bingham. No matter though it be covered with seven bull-hides and a plate of brass, like that of one of Homer's heroes, we remember, if we mistake not—for the volume is far off—a rotten spot in it, which makes it useless in a contest with one who knows that FACT. It seems our friend's studies have not made him aware of this "fact," as it is not to be supposed for a moment he is conscious that there is a mistake in his left-hand. Bingham, then, brings in Irenæus as testifying that, when Paul summoned the elders of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, "the bishops and presbyters that were from Ephesus, and the rest of the nearest cities," obeyed the call. (Irenæus II, xiv, 2: "*In Mileto convocatis episcopis et presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso, et a reliquis proximis civitatibus.*")

Now of two things, one: either Irenæus was ignorant of the real

fact as stated by Luke in Acts xx, or he knowingly suppressed it. In either case, his authority is destroyed, supposing he actually wrote these words. But we have not the smallest doubt that here, as on so many other occasions, the episcopal forger has been at work. But, then, what becomes of Bingham?

The late excellent, learned, and laborious Alford, Dean of Canterbury, thus refers to the subject in his commentary on the passage: "This circumstance" (namely, Paul's calling the elders of Ephesus together) "began very early to contradict the growing views of the apostolic institution and necessity of prelatical episcopacy." Quoting the words from Irenæus, he adds:

"Here we see (1) the two, bishops and presbyters, distinguished as if *both* were sent for, in order that the titles might not seem to belong to the same persons; and (2) other neighboring Churches also brought in, in order that there might not seem to be *episcopoi* (bishops) in one Church only. So early did interested and disingenuous interpretations begin to cloud the light which Scripture might have thrown on ecclesiastical questions."

Could any thing but truth have induced a dignitary of the Anglican Church to have uttered such a criticism? Alford knew very well that to write thus was not the likely way to exalt him from the deanery to the throne of Canterbury. Neither was this the only occasion on which he exposed the crooked ways of the prelatical faction, as we shall be obliged by and by to show. It is clear, however, that Bingham's authority is destroyed. Because what we said of Irenæus is equally applicable to him. He either knew, or he did not, the real fact in the case. If he did, why did he suppress it? If not, his ignorance taints all the nine volumes of his nephew's costly edition.

But now for the spear of Hooker, the "judicious," that Achilles of the Church, so-called. The shaking of that spear has no terrors for us. We think we have tested its temper, and proved its brittleness. We had not thought worth while to make a note of poor Bingham's blunder (we can afford to be charitable); but Hooker, the mighty, was not treated so slightly. We made a note of him, and here it is: In Book V, page 273, of Volume I, we find "four general propositions that may be reasonably granted concerning" matters of outward form, in the exercise of true religion; and, fifthly, of a rule not safe nor reasonable in these cases.

I. "The first thing, therefore, which is of force to cause approbation

with good conscience toward such customs and rites as publicly are established, is, when there ariseth from the due consideration of those customs and rites in themselves apparent reason . . . to shew their conveniency and fitness in regard for the use for which they should serve."

In illustrating this very vague statement, Hooker assumes that "the Church is the most excellent society on earth," and that "her public services ought to be glorious," etc.

It is a wonderful proof of the power of worldly interests, custom, and prejudice, when such notions should for ages have passed for "judicious" and unanswerable. What is the Church? What is her "excellence?" What makes her public duties "glorious?" Behold Hooker's Church when his "Ecclesiastical Polity" was penned! What was her head? The worthy daughter of that monster Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth. What was the right-hand of that head? John Whitgift? What were his "glorious public duties?" Stretching the saints of God on the rack, plunging them in dungeons, putting them to death on the gallows if they persistently refused to go to the head of the Church, and presumed to give their reasons for standing aloof. Yes, it was to perform such "*glorious public services*" of Hooker's "most excellent society on earth," that Henry's daughter paid her "little black husband," as she called Whitgift, the large revenues of Canterbury, so far as they were not curtailed by her gifts to her favorites, Leicester and Essex, etc. Our "Church" friend knows, or *may* know, these to be *facts* in the history of his mother "Church," which boasts of being the daughter of Rome, and is certainly entitled to the honor; and let him especially not forget the most damning fact of all, for Richard Hooker and his famous work, that he wrote it to *vindicate these doings*, and that "the wages of" his "iniquity" were the tithes of Boscomb, which he had begged from the bloody hands of Elizabeth Tudor's "little black husband," that old Anglican inquisitor, John Whitgift. Our friend shall never persuade us that such enormities had any "conveniency and fitness" "in the exercise of true religion."

II. Hooker's second proposition: "Neither may we in this case lightly esteem what has been allowed as fit in the judgment of antiquity, and by the long-continued practice of the whole Church, from which unnecessarily to swerve, experience never, as yet, has found safe."

Who will explain this? What does Hooker mean by "antiquity?" its "judgment?" The decision of the apostles and *elders* and *members* of the Church at Jerusalem? or the decision of the Council of Ephesus three centuries after, which was called the Council of Robbers? Surely, these two councils were very different; but Hooker's rule demands equal respect for both. "What doth such arguing prove?" Is not this the very language of the Romanist when he clings to his inventions?

III. Hooker's third rule: "The Church being a body that dieth not, hath always power, as occasion requireth, no less to ordain that which never was, than to ratify what hath been before."

What more did any Pope ever demand than this? Had not Peter declared by the Holy Spirit, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God?"

IV. Hooker's fourth rule: "There are ancient ordinances (laws which on all hands are allowed to be just and good; yea, divine and apostolic institutions) which the Church, it may be, doth not always keep, nor always deserve blame in that respect."

Hooker's Church obeyed a woman in whatever she commanded, though Christ's apostle had said, "I suffer not a woman to teach." When she required all babes to be immersed in baptism, except such as were so weak as to make dipping dangerous, Hooker dipped the babes. If the mother or the midwife did not like the trouble of dipping, and said they feared the babe might die, the obsequious Richard probably baptized the tips of his fingers, and sprinkled the babe. The exception soon thrust out the rule of immersion. The Divine command and apostolic practice were the immersion of believers. Both believing and immersion have disappeared in the Anglican sect, and in all the sects except the Baptist, in baptism. Is not the ordinance subverted? Hooker's fourth rule seems made expressly to justify all such impieties.

V. To his four rules Hooker adds a caution, which declares that "the rule of men's private spirits is not safe in these matters." Cartwright and Travers, Hooker's learned antagonists, did not appeal to their "private spirits," but to the Word of God. Hooker, indeed, could always say to their plainest demonstrations, "These are merely your 'private spirits;'" but what better was Hooker's "ecclesiastical polity," or Elizabeth's dogmatism and Whitgift's slavish tyranny?

One grand difference between the Dissenters and their persecutors was, that Elizabeth and *her* bishops (for *she* made them, as, indeed, she boasted) had the stake and gallows to carry out *their* "private spirits," proving very clearly that infernal spirits were inspiring them. But that was not the only difference between Hooker and Travers. Travers appealed to Paul, and Hooker at last appealed to Whitgift, and had his antagonist's mouth stopped, and got rewarded by the living of Boscomb and the sinecures of Salisbury Cathedral. Did not this demonstrate that both the archbishop and the priest felt beaten in the argument when they *gagged* the Puritan? One point more, and, we believe our readers will allow, we may safely put Hooker aside. We undertake to demonstrate that Hooker was what Paul calls a *haireticos*; what the English Bible calls a heretic; though the word, as every scholar knows, means *sectarian*. Yes: Hooker was a most pernicious sectarian. The proof: Paul says that a *haireticos*, a sectarian, is *self-condemned* (*autokatakritos*). We mean to make it clear to every unprejudiced mind, that Hooker was compelled to confess himself a condemned man. How is this demonstrated? Why, in the very book that Churchmen swear by, that Keble edited, but which, after all, neither bishops nor priests seem ever to have read, Hooker is obliged to confess that *Ferome is against him*. Our Episcopalian friend who has so kindly undertaken to enlighten us Christians, as we call ourselves, or Campbellites, as the sects nickname us, does not know this about Hooker, though he has been conning him so long. Nor is this so wonderful, after all. Hooker's ordinary style is so clumsy and involved as to make reading horrible drudgery. The first book is grand, and it is that by which Hooker has got his glory. Even Hallam did not pretend to have read the whole; and we doubt if there ever was a bishop that honestly went through it without sleeping. For, supposing bishops to have average honesty, how could they go on for three centuries crying up Hooker as an oracle, when that oracle is struck dumb by the truth. Hooker labored hard to make Jerome say that episcopacy was divine; but Jerome was obstinate, and Hooker was compelled to give up his task in despair. And he records his defeat. It is supposed that he put down his confession on the margin of his manuscript, intending to attempt the solution of the enigma by and by. But he died before he satisfied himself; the marginal note some-

how crept into the text. At all events, in Keble's costly edition, the sentence in which Hooker confesses Jerome to be against him is put in brackets.

Now, we maintain that Hooker was thus *self-condemned*. He proved himself, in Paul's sense, a *sectarian*. For who was Jerome? The most learned of the Latin Fathers—the man who, along with Augustine, according to Milman, was the founder of the Latin Church; that is, of the Papacy. This man, though only a presbyter, was bowed to by Augustine as his superior in learning; and yet, in his commentary on Titus I, he writes: "*Idem est ergo Presbyter, qui et Episcopus—The Presbyter and the Bishop are the same.*" Augustine himself, in a letter to Jerome, confesses that it was merely *custom* which made the bishop greater than the presbyter; and, of course, Divine or apostolic authority had nothing to do with it. But this was the very thing that Hooker wrote his work to demonstrate; for with what face could he vindicate the murderous, inquisitorial outrages of the ecclesiastical courts except on the plea that episcopacy was divine? Of course, though that had been true, it would have been no reason for racking and hanging the Puritan. Accordingly, as quoted by our would-be teacher (page 171, Hooker vii, 2, 3) holds "regiments by bishops" to be "a thing most lawful, *divine*, and holy in the Church of Christ." Of course, if episcopacy was *divine*, it was superfluous to say it was "most lawful" and "holy." Did this excess of assertion betray a hesitation about episcopacy being "divine?" At all events, he was outdoing Whitgift in zeal, as *he* expressly denied the *divinity* of episcopacy; of course, condemning himself all the more for dipping his hands in blood to maintain it—the blood of the saints.

Our Episcopalian friend (page 161) refers to the elders of Ephesus. He does not venture, like his Bingham, to quote Irenæus as testifying that there were bishops as well as elders from the cities nearest to Ephesus. "In his tender and beautiful address, he tells them that, 'after his departing,' not only should grievous wolves enter in among them, not sparing the flock," but "*also of their own selves* [among the very overseers] should men arise, speaking perverse things and [to?] draw away disciples after them." He therefore bade them to "watch," and to "remember" his counsels and his "tears."

"Now, what remedy did he offer for this state of things which

he predicted?" It seems perfectly plain, on the very face of the text, that the only remedy, which Paul prescribed for the predicted mischief, was the "*watching*" of the elders. But our friend differs from Paul about the remedy. He insists that the elders needed some one with "*supreme pastoral authority over the Church.*" When Paul recalled Timothy from Ephesus, it was only "*temporarily,*" (how does he know *that*?) and the apostle then "sent Tychicus in his stead." "To each of them, in turn, he has given supreme pastoral authority over the Church." But this is all mere prelatiical fancy, not *fact*. Paul says not a syllable about setting Timothy or Tychicus with "supreme pastoral authority over them." He entreats and commands *them* to "watch," not merely over "the flock bought with the blood of God," but to watch one another, as "men would arise from among themselves, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them;" that is, the Ephesian disciples, as the word has the article, which James I's translators, as usual, did not see. It is plain the simple, naked word of the apostle is not enough for Episcopalians. No wonder they are so fond of what they call "tradition." They seem never to have heard of the text (1 Cor. 4, 6) which forbids any thing above what is written: "That by us ye might learn the lesson, Nothing above what is written."* Our critic demands: "Now, what remedy did he offer for this state of things which he had predicted?" It is undeniable that Paul's remedy was the "*watching*" of the elders. Nay, says the believer in bishops, it was "the supreme pastoral authority" of Bishop Timothy, or Bishop Tychicus, or Bishop Titus, or Bishop Epaphroditus. If the wolves came, after all, the *Episcopal* watchmen must have been "dumb dogs." The Episcopalians insist there have always been bishops since the apostles. Of what use have they been? The wolves came after Paul was gone, unless he was a false prophet. *Who* were the wolves? *When* did they come? *How* did they come?

We do not observe that our friend puts these questions. He does not say, so far as we remember, that the *heretics* were the wolves. Of course, he denies that the Catholics could be wolves; and as for the pagans, they did not enter the Church to draw away the disciples after them. If they were neither heretics, Churchmen,

* See T. S. Green's translation, and "Bishops and Councils," by James Lillie, D. D., etc.

nor pagans, *who* could they be? Is it possible the *prelates* were the wolves? If so, those who have gloried in the name of Churchmen and in apostolic succession must be the guilty parties. Of course, our friend is shocked at such an impious suggestion. We beg him to keep calm, and attend to what follows.

Let us, then, not forget, in our search for the wolves, that they were to appear in the Church of Ephesus after Paul was gone. Who knows but one of those that listened to the apostle's melting and awful farewell might be a Diotrephes, with the sheep-skin so well adjusted that even Paul's eye saw neither claw nor tooth? There had been a Judas among the Twelve, and there might even then be a wolf among the elders of Ephesus.

However this might be, we know that, before the apostle John left the world, men had appeared in the Church of Ephesus, *calling themselves apostles*. In his letter to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, "He that walked amid the seven golden candlesticks" said to John, "Write, Thou hast tried those who say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." We see, therefore, that wolves, or at least the harbingers of the wolves, actually appeared in Ephesus, and that they *pretended to be apostles*, but were detected as *liars*. Therefore, men may call themselves apostles, or *successors* of the apostles, and be liars, after all.

Let us remember also our Lord's prediction of the false prophets: "Guard yourselves from the * false prophets, who are coming to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are tearing wolves; from their fruits you will come to know them." (Matt. vii, 15, 16.) We have no reason to suppose that our Lord is speaking of any thing that was actually taking place when the words were spoken. While the Good Shepherd was with his little flock, the wolves were absent. But even then they were "coming." They seemed to belong to the flock, in wearing the sheep's-skin. In this we have another sure mark of the wolves. They would make an imposing profession of piety. Before he finishes his discourse, he predicts the doom of these fatal pretenders to holiness (verse 22): "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name, and in thy name cast out demons, and in thy name do many mighty works? and then will I profess to them, Never did I know you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

* Article noticed by T. S. Green, etc. See "Bishops and Councils."

In addition to the two marks of pretensions to apostolicity and piety, we obtain three other marks of the "coming wolves." They would be notorious for repetitions of the name of the Lord, for violations of his commandments, and for their great number. "Many will say to me," etc.

With these five marks, therefore—namely, pretended apostolicity; spurious piety, or a mere outside religion; loud talk about the divinity of Christ, Lord, Lord; palpable, gross immoralities; and vast numbers—let us calmly survey the early ages of Christianity, and see whether that Divine system did not bless the world during the first two centuries and the former half of the third, and that before the close of the third century the scene has changed most amazingly and awfully.

We undertake to demonstrate that, while the Churches of Christ maintained the true succession of the apostles in the Divinely appointed eldership, they were "the golden candlesticks" of the world, and that darkness and misery and ruin came in with *episcopacy*.

Our Episcopal brother is probably shocked, possibly amused, at the audacity of our undertaking. But before he yields to first impressions, let him patiently weigh the evidence which we bring forward. Our witnesses are, first, the chief apostolical Fathers, in whom the hierarchy, whether Papal or Anglican, glories; and, second, the *prelates* of the third and fourth centuries. If we do not truly report their testimony, we can be exposed by competent scholarship, as we always refer to chapter and section.

I. Our first witness is CLEMENT, of Rome. The Romanists claim him as one of their first Popes, after Peter; and the Anglicans say he was Bishop of Rome. Both assertions are equally false; for Clement was a plain presbyter or elder, as his two letters demonstrate. We read them with the greater interest, as we have reason to believe he is the same person who is mentioned by Paul as having his name "in the Book of Life." Of course, in that case, being a beloved contemporary of our great apostle, his testimony may be called apostolic. The testimony of Clement is contained in two letters which he wrote to the Church of Corinth. The occasion that called forth the letters was a feud in that Church between the elders and some unruly members that were misleading their brethren.

Clement, then, does not write as a bishop, far less as a Pope, as

he has been called by Eusebius, but as a plain presbyter, a mere elder ; and as there was, as yet, no bishop in Rome, so it was in Corinth. Clement's letters are addressed not to a bishop, not even to the elders, but directly to the members of the Church. In chapter xiii, he says : "And thus preaching through the countries and cities" (he is speaking of the apostles), "they appointed their first-fruits, having first proved them through the Spirit, overseers (*episcopous*) and deacons for those who were about to believe." In chapter xlv, he says : "And our apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus, that there would be strife about the name *overseership* (*episcopoen*). For this reason, having received a perfect foreknowledge, they appointed those before mentioned, and meanwhile gave direction that when they should have fallen asleep, other proved men should receive their ministry." Our Episcopal friend, dealing with these passages as he has done with Acts i, 20, will tell us they are on his side. We will translate *episcopous*, bishops, as, in his note to page 163, he very confidently asserts, "The word *episcopoen* (ἐπισκοπήν) plainly meant *the office of a bishop*;" and of course ἐπισκοποι must be *bishops*. However common this loose (to use no harsher word) way of dealing may be with Neander, Dr. Schaff, and his Episcopal and dissenting friends in England, it is reprehensible, because they know well enough the word *bishop*, in England, has always meant prelate, and nothing else. No doubt the Bible Union is censurable, as well as Dean Alford, for rendering the word "*office*;" but our critic is far more censurable for making it "*the office of a bishop*." Of that translation Alford justly declares, in his comment on 1 Tim. iii, 1, that *it sets a trap* for the common English reader. That trap was set incautiously and unconsciously by good W. Tyndale, and was gladly continued by James I's bishops, and, we must charitably believe, has caught our Episcopal brother.

Our next extract will show that Clement uses ἐπισκοπους, and its cognate, just as Paul does ; that is, it is the precise synonym of elders. In chapter xlvii, Clement says : "Disgraceful, beloved—yea, highly disgraceful and unworthy of the guidance in Christ—is the report that the very steadfast and ancient Church of the Corinthians should, for one or two persons, revolt against the elders." It is undeniable, therefore, that Clement uses the two terms, *overseers* and *elders*, as meaning the same office ; and that the only Divinely

appointed successors of the apostles, as rulers in the Church, are elders or presbyters; and we may add, if it was so "disgraceful," yea so "very disgraceful," in the judgment of Clement, for "the Church of Corinth to revolt against the elders for one or two men," why should our Episcopalians and Methodists be so pleased, as they seem, to have their presbyters shorn of their divine rights for a very few men whom, in defiance of Clement, and, as we shall show, of all pure antiquity, they dishonor by that fatal title, *bishop*.

II. Our second witness is POLYCARP. Our Episcopalian tells us (page 167) that Irenæus "declares the apostles made him Bishop of Smyrna," and, no doubt, both Neander and Mosheim concur in the title; and yet we are not afraid to maintain that Irenæus never said Polycarp was bishop, that is, *prelate* of Smyrna. This we shall show when we come to consider Irenæus's testimony; and we are sure Neander and Mosheim are wrong, if they use the word *bishop* in its only true English sense of *prelate*.

We are thus confident, because we have letters from Polycarp to the Church of Philippi; and these, like Paul's to the same body, are addressed to the elders and deacons, of course not excluding the saints in general. This proves that, in the middle of the second century, the Philippians still retained this twofold apostolic constitution of elders and deacons.

And if the address of Polycarp's letters to the "elders and deacons" of Philippi proves that there was no bishop there about the middle of the second century, the way he speaks of himself unanswerably demonstrates that he was nothing more than a plain presbyter, or elder. What is his language? "Polycarp and those who, with him, are elders," etc. Does not this plainly assert that Polycarp claimed no higher rank than his brethren whom he unites with himself as sending the letters? This proves unanswerably that the constitutions of the two Churches of Philippi and Smyrna still remained apostolic in the middle of the second century; that is, they were ruled by elders and served by deacons.

Ignatius is brought forward by Dr. Lightfoot, of Cambridge, England, to prove that Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna; but the assertion, like all that passes current with Churchmen, about Ignatius and his letters, and not only with them, but with all others who are misled by their confident tone,—that assertion, we say, has no real

foundation. Why, Dr. Lightfoot himself, in his Index, brands the letters of Ignatius as *spurious*. How inconsistent to try to bolster up his argument about Polycarp by evidence which he confesses to be spurious! Of course, our friend, who has taken in hand our conversion to episcopacy, has never heard of Ignatius *the Forger*, but devoutly believes that the martyr was actually Bishop of Antioch in the beginning of the second century, having succeeded Evodius, who was really ordained to that See by the apostles themselves! He chides us severely for not admiring the martyrs; but their worst enemies have been the lying Churchmen, who have filled their volumes with legends about them, that not only disgrace their own character,* but also tend to taint the memories of those noble witnesses who are the victims of their ignorant or hypocritical eulogies.

III. Our third witness is HERMAS, the apostolic Bunyan, and author of "The Shepherd," who is reported by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Jerome, and others of the Fathers, as the same with the Hermas mentioned by Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. (Chap. xvi, 14.) This most interesting and illustrious personage, writing very early in the second century, clearly shows that the government of the Church was still apostolic; that is, it was carried on by elders or presbyters. He thus confirms his apostolic contemporaries, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp of Smyrna:†

"In B. I, Vis. ii, c. 4, Hermas is commanded to 'write two books, and to send one to Clement,' etc. 'But you will read the words in this city, with the elders who preside over the Church.' In Vis. iii, 9, he warns 'those who preside over the Church, and love the first seats,' not to be 'drug-mixers,' which, taken in connection with what follows, seems to imply that the poison of ambition was working in the hearts of the presbyters, who, like the twelve apostles before Pentecost, were contending which should be the greatest! Here we have prelacy in its beginning.

"This seems very strikingly confirmed by what we find in COMMAND XI. 'He pointed out to me some men sitting on a bench (*subsellium*), and one man sitting on a chair (*cathedra*); and he says to me, 'Do you see the persons sitting on the bench?' "I do, sir," said I. "These," says he, "are the faithful; and he who sits on the chair is a false prophet, ruining the souls of his brethren. Some true words he does occasionally utter.'" Here we see 'the false prophet,' 'the wolf,' predicted by Christ and Paul and Peter and John, sitting in the chair—the prelate's throne; while those who were as yet faithful were sitting on a bench, but whose minds were being ruined, even by the true words which the false prophet spoke. It is clear, then, that the strife in the preceding quotation had ended in

* See "Bishops and Councils," page 25.

† *Ib.*, pp. 28-30.

the elevation of the false prophet to the throne of the prelate, and that he did not gain his 'bad eminence' without speaking 'some good words.' These concealed the 'drug-poison' that was ruining the souls of the enslaved presbyters. The 'goods words' of the chairman 'had deceived the hearts of the simple,' as Paul warned the Romans there was a danger from those 'who made divisions;' the 'bondmen to their bellies,' and 'not to Christ.' Those who have spoken most against schismatics have been always the greatest schism-makers.

"Dr. Lightfoot's treatment of Hermas is very singular. He merely takes a small part of the striking picture of the faithful men on the bench, and the false prophet on the prelate's throne; and, after one or two equally brief references to other passages, winds up thus: 'If we could accept the suggestion that, in this class of passages, the writer condemns the ambition which aimed at transforming the Presbyterian into the Episcopal form of government, we should have arrived at a solution of the difficulty; but the rebukes are couched in the most general terms, and apply at least as well to the ambitious pursuit of existing *offices* as to the arrogant assertion of a hitherto unrecognized power. This clew failing us, the notices in the "Shepherd" are, in themselves, too vague to lead to any definite result.' (Pages 217, 218.)

"In the striking passage which I quote from Command XI, and which Dr. Lightfoot touches so lightly, the language is not vague, but very precise. He does not condemn the ambitious pursuit of existing *offices* (that he *had* done already in our previous quotation); he condemns the sitter in the prelate's chair—the 'false prophet' who had already got the faithful men down on the bench. The 'clew' does not seem to fail the doctor. Does he not drop it when it is leading him away from prelacy?"

IV. Our fourth witness is PAPIAS. He, as well as Polycarp and Ignatius, was a disciple of the apostle John. Eusebius will have him to have been "Bishop of Hierapolis," and Dr. Lightfoot is pleased to mark the title, and Neander, according to his wont, acquiesces in the High Church custom. Very possibly, Mosheim had preceded him in the foolish fashion. And we may note, in passing, it seems hardly prudent in our friend to sneer at these historians as "theorists." The truth is, their bias is palpably in favor of the self-styled Catholics; and it is only by going to the sources of history for ourselves that we can escape the prelatical virus, which, somehow, in spite of his independent professions, has so deeply tainted our Episcopalian *doctor*. What, then, says Papias? The witness speaks through the mouth of Prelate Eusebius, and though we know, from Eusebius's own confession, he is apt to be unscrupulous where the honor of the "Church"—that is, of the bishops—is concerned, yet, in this case, the historian seems to have got the better of the bishop, for he tells us (B. III, chap. xlix) that Papias declared, "I will not be slow to set in order also for thee, whatsoever I well learned, and well remem-

bered, from the elders," etc. "If any one came who had closely followed the elders, I was in the habit of carefully inquiring into the sayings of the elders. What Andrew or Peter said, or what Philip said, or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any of the Lord's disciples, which things Aristion and John, the elder, *are saying*."* The change of the tense seems to imply that Aristion and the "elder" were still speaking to him.

Now, this is very remarkable and very instructive. Good Papias does not even call our Lord's first disciples "*apostles*." They are all "*elders*." That divine title, in which John, as well as Peter, gloried, and which Paul honored when speaking of his own hand, when laid on the head of Timothy, as one of the hands of the presbytery,—that divine title, I say again, was the only one recognized by Papias, and he would listen to no man who did not closely follow the "ELDERS." Had all the so-called Fathers been like him, never would the Church and the world have been cursed by bishops.

We maintain, therefore, in spite of the "*Catholics*," with Neander and Mosheim and Schaff, etc., to keep them in countenance, that it is simply ridiculous to parade honest Papias as a bishop. By a divine instinct, apparently, he detests the very word *ἐπισκοπός*, which was to bring, by its wicked abuse, such innumerable woes into our world.

V. Our fifth witness is Pius of Rome, whom Romanists make the first of the name, now borne by the "infallible" old man, who, by the last accounts, still lingers on the footstool. Dr. Lightfoot will have it he was the brother of "Shepherd" Hermas, our beloved "Bunyan," of the first or second century. We know nothing about his fraternity "after the flesh." We rejoice to believe he was a brother in Christ. Bishop Eusebius is again the instrument through which the witness speaks. The historian has preserved two letters addressed by Pius to Justus, Episcopus Viennensis, overseer of the Church of Vienne, which demonstrate that that Church was not prelatic. He congratulates Justus in the first on having been chosen by the brethren to the place of Verus in the eldership of Vienne. He speaks of elders (presbyters) as those who, having been educated by the apostles, have come down to us. Not a syllable of prelates having

* "Bishops and Councils," page 26.

come down from the apostles. The other letter is just as clear as this. It is needless to quote it.

VI. Our sixth witness is the unknown author of the admirable letter to Diognetus, who thus describes (chap. v) the manners of the Christians:

"Christians are distinguished from other men, neither by country nor language, nor the customs which they observe; for they neither inhabit cities of their own, nor employ a peculiar form of speech, nor lead a life which is distinguished by any peculiarity. The course of conduct which they follow, has not been devised by any speculation or deliberation of inquisitive men; nor do they, like some, proclaim themselves the advocates of any merely human doctrines. But inhabiting Greek as well as Barbarian cities, according as the lot of each of them has determined, and following the customs of the natives as to clothing, food, and the rest of their ordinary conduct, they display to us their wonderful and confessedly paradoxical method of life. They dwell in their own countries, but simply as sojourners. As citizens, they share in all things with others, and yet endure all things as foreigners. Every foreign land is to them as their native country, and every land of their birth as a land of strangers. They marry as all do; they beget children, but they do not destroy them; they have a common table, but not a common bed; they are in the flesh, but they do not live after the flesh; they pass their days on earth, but are citizens of heaven; they obey the prescribed laws, and, at the same time, surpass the laws by their lives; they love all men, and are persecuted by all; they are unknown and condemned; they are put to death and restored to life; they are poor, yet make many rich; they are in lack of all things, and yet abound in all; they are dishonored, and yet in their very dishonor they are glorified; they are evil spoken of, and yet are justified; they are reviled and bless; they are insulted, and repay the insult with honor; they do good, and yet are punished as evil-doers; when punished, they rejoice as quickened into life; they are assailed by the Jews as foreigners, and are persecuted by the Greeks, yet those who hate them are unable to assign any reason for their hatred."

It is clear the *wolves* had not yet got into Churches which this writer describes; they were all outside. Nor have we the slightest reason to suppose there were, as yet, any bishops; that is, *prelates*. It was the taunt of Celsus, the first literary assailant of Christianity, who wrote about the same time as our author—that is, toward the beginning of the second century—that "wool-workers, cobblers, leather-dressers, the most illiterate and vulgar of mankind, were zealous preachers of the Gospel." These were the true successors of the fishermen of Galilee, of Paul and Aquila, "*the tent-makers*."

VII. Our seventh witness is JUSTIN MARTYR, who got his noble title about 165, in the persecution under Marcus Aurelius. In his

"First Apology," chap. lxvii, he gives an account of the Christian mode of observing the Lord's-supper, in their weekly worship, on the Lord's-day:

"We afterward continually remind each other of these things" (he had been giving an account of the Lord's-supper, thus showing that, with primitive Christians, the most interesting of all subjects was the central truth of Christianity—the death of Christ), "and the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things with which we are supported, we bless the Maker of all, through his son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities, or in the country, come together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as the time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together, and pray; and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given; and to those who are absent, a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well-to-do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in fine, takes care of all who are in need."

The Episcopalian will no doubt fasten on the term "president," so honored in our nation, as proving the existence of a prelate, but the fancy is irreconcilable with the context. The "president" presided over one congregation, and not over a hundred or a thousand.

VIII. Our eighth witness against prelacy is IRENÆUS. Our friend seems quite at home with the "Bishop" of Lyons. He says: "Irenæus, who lived in the second half of this century [the second], and was himself Bishop of Lyons, in France, is our first and greatest witness . . . to the episcopate as being of apostolic origin." "He has appealed to" Irenæus; "to" Irenæus "he shall go." We will now cross-examine his "greatest witness," and will leave our unprejudiced readers to judge whether he does not prove the *elder-ship* as the true *apostolic succession*.

Irenæus, please inform us what is the "tradition of the apostles about the rulers in the Church."

Irenæus (Book III., c. ii, 2): "*The tradition which originates from the apostles is preserved by means of the succession of elders in the Churches.*"

But, then, does not Irenæus, in the very Third Book and next

chapter tell us, "We are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted *bishops* in the Churches?" Undoubtedly; and it is only this last passage which our friend quotes. We should be sorry to suspect him of any disingenuousness here. He takes matters as he finds them, at second-hand, in the manuals of his sect. Besides, he is entitled to much allowance, as the loose talk of Mosheim, Neander, Schaff, etc., about Bishop Irenæus and Bishop Polycarp and Bishop Ignatius, is only fitted to mislead those who can not consult the original sources of evidence for themselves. What does Irenæus mean by "*bishop*?" In calling his presbyters bishops, he is just doing what Luke and Paul had taught him to do. Luke tells us (Acts xx) that Paul sent for the presbyters, or elders, of Ephesus, and these elders Paul calls bishops. Was not this a safe example to follow? I will call up the "greatest witness" for the "episcopate" once more.

Irenæus, please inform us what you think is our duty to the rulers in the Church?

Irenæus (B. IV, c. xxvi, 2, 3): "It is incumbent to obey the presbyters, who are in the Church, who have the succession from the apostles, as we have shown, who, with the succession of the oversight (*episcopatus*), have also received the sure grace of truth."

Is it not demonstrated that Irenæus's episcopate is presbytery; that the only bishop he acknowledges is an elder? Let us hear the old Father again. Irenæus, you have just told us that the elder is the true successor of the apostle. As we have much confidence in your wisdom, please tell us how we should feel toward those who have departed from this primitive succession?

"Greatest witness" to the episcopate: "We should hold in suspicion those who have departed from the primitive succession. Those, however, who are believed to be presbyters by many, but serve their own lusts, and do not place the fear of God supreme in their hearts, but conduct themselves with contempt toward others, and are puffed up with the pride of holding the chief seat, and work evil deeds in secret, saying, 'No man sees,' shall be convicted by the Word. From all such persons, therefore, it behooves us to keep aloof, but to adhere to those who, as I have already observed, do hold the doctrine of the apostles, and who, together with the order of the eldership (*presbyterii ordine*), display sound speech and blameless conduct."

We therefore insist that our friend's "greatest witness to the episcopate," "though dead, yet speaketh," and exhorts him to quit his present associates, and to "adhere to us, who do hold the doctrine of the apostles, and who, together with the order of the eldership, display sound speech and blameless conduct."

However unanswerable our appeal, we confess we have no expectation that our Episcopal brother will ever become one of us. It is more likely that, with some of his brother priests in England, he should land at Rome at last. We say so because, logically, High Church fancies are apt to lead thither. He tells us that Irenæus "declares that the apostles themselves made Linus the first Bishop" of Rome. Why does he again garble the Father? Why not quote the assertion in its connection? Did he never look into the old folio for himself? Here stands the passage (Book III, c. iii, 2, 3):

"The very ancient and universally known Church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, as also the faith preached to men which comes down to our time by the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church on account of its pre-eminent authority." (*Potio rem principalitatem.*) "The blessed apostles, then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate."

If he refuses to bow to Rome's "*pre-eminent authority*," he belies his own "greatest witness;" he rejects the episcopacy of Linus, and withdraws his own quotation. Which will he prefer? He must choose one or the other. He has no other alternative. If he gives up Linus, he must agree with us that the whole passage is spurious, and has been foisted in by the Romish forgers. In short, it is a print of the paw of the wolf of Rome.

IX. Our ninth witness is CLEMENT of Alexandria. He flourished about the beginning of the third century, and was the great man of his Church. Of course, there was no prelate in that Church at *that time*. Clement of Alexandria is one of the most learned of Ante-Nicene Fathers, and his testimony is clear against prelacy. In his *Stromata*, or Miscellanies (B. VII, i), he says: "In most things there are two sorts of ministry—the one higher, the other inferior. . . . Just so in the Church, the presbyters have the nobler ministry, the deacons the serving one."

But the Episcopalian* refers to Clement's tract styled the "Peda-

* Dr. Lightfoot, Hulsean Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, England.

gogue" (iii, 12): "Ten thousand such suggestions are written in the Holy Books belonging to chosen persons, some to elders, some to overseers, some to deacons," etc.; and thinks Clement here acknowledges three orders; and our friend on this side the Atlantic may demand, in triumph, Is it not undeniable that Clement speaks of the overseer? that is, the bishop, as distinct from the presbyter, and superior to him, as the word *overseer* necessarily implies. We allow that in Clement's time—that is, about one hundred years after the apostle John—there was a president in the presbytery of the congregation or Church, or a chairman among the elders; but this did not make the president of a different order from his brethren. Whether he was chosen by a direct vote of the congregation as the other elders, or chosen by the elders from among themselves, he was merely the presiding elder, and nothing more. The direct vote is preferred in all our Churches, as well as in all the Presbyterian; whereas, in the Church of Alexandria, the presbytery chose their own overseer from their own number; but in both instances the power was essentially *democratic*; and that power was established by the apostles in all the Churches of Christ. Acts xiv, 23: "*Having appointed by vote*" (ἔτις ποτον ἑσυντε-), etc. The constitution of the Church of Alexandria, in the beginning of the third century, therefore was *not* Episcopalian; that is, prelatic.

X. Our tenth witness is TERTULLIAN, the famous Presbyter of Carthage. This extraordinary and most eloquent man flourished in the beginning of the third century, and was consequently contemporary with Clement of Alexandria, and, like him, was also the great man of his Church; and as they were both presbyters, we have thus demonstration that there was, in their time, no prelate in either Church. As the prelatical "theory" of our friend demands a prelate in each, we challenge him to tell us who the prelates were in the beginning of the third century, in Alexandria and in Carthage, and how such a fancy can be reconciled with Clement's acknowledged writings, just quoted, or with the striking extract which we now present from chap. xxxix of Tertullian's "Apology":*

"We are a body in regard to a consciousness of obligation, and a unity of discipline, and a covenant of hope. We meet together as an assembly and congregation, that, offering up prayer to God as with united force, we may wrestle with him

* Tertullian's "Apology," page 68, pam. edit. fol.

in our supplication. This violence God delights in. We pray, too, for the emperors, for their ministers, and for all in authority; for the welfare of the world, for the prevalence of peace, for the delay of the end. We assemble to read our sacred writings, if any peculiarity of the times makes either forewarning or reminiscence needful. Certainly, with the sacred words we nourish our faith, we animate our hope, we make our confidence more steadfast, and no less, by inculcation of God's precepts, we confirm good habits. In the same place, also, exhortations are made, rebukes and sacred censures are administered. For with a great gravity is the work of judging carried on among us, as befits those who feel assured they are in the sight of God; and have the most notable example of judgment to come, when any one has sinned so grievously as to require severance from us in prayer, and the meeting, and all sacred intercourse. The tried men of our elders preside over us, having obtained that honor not by purchase, but by established character. There is no buying or selling of any sort in the things of God. Though we have our treasure-chest, it is not made up of purchase-money, as of a religion that has its price. On the monthly collection-day, every one, if he likes, puts in a small donation; but only if it be his pleasure, for there is no compulsion; all is voluntary. These gifts are, as it were, piety's deposit fund. For they are not taken thence and spent in feasts, and drinking-bouts, and eating-houses, but to support and bury poor people, to supply the wants of boys and girls destitute of means and parents, and of old persons confined now to the house, such as have suffered shipwreck; and if there happen to be any who are in the mines, or banished to the islands, or shut up in the prisons, for nothing but their fidelity to the cause of God's Church, they become the nurslings of their confession. But it is mainly the deeds of a love so noble that lead many to put a mark on us. See, say they, how they love one another (for themselves are animated by mutual hatred), how they are ready even to die for one another (for they themselves will sooner be put to death). And they are wroth with us, too, because we call each other brethren; for no other reason, as I think, but because names of consanguinity are assumed, among them, in mere pretense of affection. But we are your brethren as well, by our common mother nature, though you are hardly men, because brethren so unkind."

The decisive "fact," we signalize, "*The tried men of our elders preside over us;*" from which it is plain, so far from having a prelate, they had not even a single stated president, as we have in our Churches, and as we see in the Presbyterian. It is no less notable what an effective discipline was maintained by these "tried elders," and what a high morality adorned the membership. Even blind paganism saw this, and could not help exclaiming, "Behold, how they love one another!"

Fifty years after Tertullian, we find the morality of the Church of Carthage ruined; and let our friend mark and explain, if he can, the "fact" that this ruin was simultaneous with the rise of episcopacy.

XI. Cyprian, the martyr and Bishop of Carthage, is our eleventh

witness to this twofold "fact." Cyprian is held up to admiration both by Romanists and Anglicans, and both are inconsistent in doing so; because the former worship the man whom Pope Stephen I excommunicated, and the latter inasmuch as Cyprian did not manage his flock as prelates do theirs. Cyprian did nothing of consequence without consulting not only the elders, but also the members of the Church. So far, he was more Scriptural than even our Presbyterian friends, not to speak of our Episcopalians. When he was hiding from persecution, he kept up a correspondence with his elders, and his letters are a contrast with the arrogance of tone assumed by his pretending successors. In his fifth letter, he thus courteously addresses his Church Council: "Since distance does not allow me to be present, I entreat you, according to your faith and piety, discharge there" [in Carthage] both your functions and mine, that nothing may be wanting either in regard to discipline or diligence."* Cyprian here "*entreats*" his presbyters to discharge *his* functions as well as their own. He speaks with the humility of Paul, "I beseech you," etc. (Rom. xii.)

This apostolic meekness, however, did not suit the hierarchy. So, as usual, they betake themselves to forgery to carry their point. Abbe Migne, in his "*Bibliotheca Patrum*," completely transforms the epistle, and turns Cyprian's "*entreat*" into "command:" "*I both exhort and command*," etc. Now it is notable that it is from this spurious, forged document that Dr. Roberts, of London, the Presbyterian editor of the Ante-Nicene Library, gives a translation. The translator is Dr. Wallis, of Wells Cathedral, England, and it would appear that both Presbyterian and Anglican somehow find their account in following Migne in his mutilated, corrupted text, rather than Dr. Fell in his magnificent folio.

Though the hand of the prelatical forger is also very visible in the Treatise "*de Lapsis*," which Cyprian wrote concerning those who had *lapsed* to paganism during persecution, yet we there find invaluable evidence in regard to the morals of the Church of Carthage before the persecution began.

"Each one," says Cyprian (chapter vi), "was desirous of increasing his estate; † and, forgetful of what believers had either done in the times of apostles, or always ought to do, they, with insatiable ardor of covetousness, devoted them-

* Oxford Edition of Cyprian, by Dr. Fell.

† "Bishops and Councils," page 50.

selves to the increase of their property. Among the priests, there was no devotedness of religion; among the ministers, there was no sound faith; in their works, there was no mercy; in their manners, there was no discipline. In men, their beards were defaced; in women, their complexion was dyed, their eyes were falsified from what God's hand had made them, their hair was stained with a falsehood. Crafty frauds were used to deceive the hearts of the simple, subtle meanings for circumventing the brethren. They united in the bond of marriage with unbelievers; they prostituted the members of Christ to the Gentiles. They would not only swear rashly, but, even more, they would swear falsely; would despise those set over them, with haughty swelling; would speak evil of one another with envenomed tongue; would quarrel with one another with obstinate hatred. Very many bishops, who should furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their thrones, deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise. Brethren starving in the Church they did not succor. They sought to possess money in hoards; they seized estates by crafty deceits; they increased their gains by multiplying usuries."

What a contrast to the picture painted by Tertullian, of the same Church, only thirty or forty years before! This, then, is the undeniable fact, that when the Church of Carthage was passing under episcopacy, it was in a state of fearful corruption. Is it not fair to conclude that moral corruption was the parent of episcopacy? Indeed, Jerome declares that such was the origin of episcopacy. He says Satan made divisions, and men made bishops to heal them. The result has shown that Satan, as usual, was too cunning for men. The remedy proved to be worse than the disease. The divisions were multiplied a thousand-fold. Let us listen to the illustrious martyr of Carthage once more in his eleventh letter:

"It must be understood and confessed, that the outrageous and heavy calamity which hath, in very great measure, laid waste our flock, and continues to lay it waste to this day, hath happened to us because of our sins, since we keep not the way of the Lord, nor observe his heavenly commands, which were designed to lead us to salvation. Christ, our Lord, fulfilled the will of his Father, but we neglect the will of the Lord. Our principal study is to get money and estates; we follow after pride; we are at leisure for nothing but emulation and quarreling, and have neglected the simplicity of the faith. We have renounced the world in words only, not in deeds. Every one studies to please himself and to displease others."*

XII. Our twelfth witness of the rise of episcopacy, in the latter half of the third century, and of the corruption in which it began, is PAUL of Samosata, who was deposed from the Metropolitan throne of Antioch in 272, for denying the Trinity. According to the testimony of his brother bishops, he was a monster of lust, pride,

* "Bishops and Councils," page 52. The passage is suppressed in Migne.

avarice, and every vice. But it is worthy of notice that, however free in mentioning the two beautiful young women that disgraced the archepiscopal palace, they said not a syllable about such enormities in the indictment. Why so cautious? Were they afraid of dangerous retorts? The questions are natural when we know that Constantine assured his Nicene bishops that, if he surprised a bishop in the act of violating his neighbor's bed, he would throw over him his imperial purple, rather than the scandal should be divulged.* Similar accusations were lodged at Nicæa against Eustathius, a successor of Paul of Antioch, and against the famous Athanasius. But Constantine, consistently with his avowed policy, burned the charges in the presence of the council. Elizabeth of England pursued the same policy twelve hundred years after, in regard to Sandys, Archbishop of York, the patron of the great Hooker. In the significant symbolism of the Apocalypse, the kings of the earth have committed fornication with the ecclesiastical harlots in all ages.

In judging of this Paul's character, Neander allows,† "Unhappily this picture accords but too well with what we otherwise learn respecting the bishops of the large towns like Antioch," and quotes Brigen's comment on Matthew :

"We, who either do not understand what the teaching of Jesus here means, or who despise these express admonitions of our Savior himself, we proceed so far in the affectation of pomp and state, as to outdo even bad rulers among the pagans; and, like the emperors, surround ourselves with a body-guard, that we may be feared and made difficult of approach, especially by the poor. And in many of our so-called Churches, particularly in the larger towns, may be found presiding officers of the Church of God, who would refuse to own even the best of the disciples of Jesus, while on earth, as their equals."

Let us remember that Origen was contemporary with Cyprian, and reliable as a martyr of Christ.

XIII. Our thirteenth witness, concerning Episcopal morality, is the celebrated EUSEBIUS, the Historian of the Council of Nicæa, as well as of the Church in general. In the Eighth Book, chap. i, of his General History, he thus paints the character of his brother bishops before they were called together by Constantine to determine the creed of Christendom :

"But when, from too much liberty, we sunk into negligence and sloth; when we had begun to envy and reproach one another; when we were carrying on, as it

* Theodoret I, 10. Stanley's East. Ch, page 150.

† Vol. I, 603.

were, intestine wars among ourselves, mutually wounding each other with words, as with weapons and spears; when leaders struggling with leaders, and people with people, were stirring up quarrels and tumults; in fine, when fraud and hypocrisy had grown to the highest pitch of wickedness,—then Divine vengeance—with light arm as usual, the state of the Churches being yet entire, and crowds of the faithful freely assembling—began sensibly and gradually to call us to account, persecution having first begun with the soldiery. When, indeed, destitute of all feeling, we were not even thinking of appeasing Divine Providence; when, rather like any atheists, thinking that human affairs were governed by no care or providence, we were daily adding crimes to crimes; when our bishops, despising the restraints of religion, were contending in mutual strifes, striving only to multiply quarrels, threats, emulation, hatreds, and mutual antipathies, most contentiously claiming for themselves a kind of tyrannical supremacy,—then," etc.

The thirty years that followed the deposition of Paul of Samosata, in Antioch, and which bring us down to the fourth century, had not improved the morals of the prelates. What are we to think of such men meeting to determine the faith of Christians for all succeeding ages? Can we wonder if the Council of Nicæa became a poisoned fountain whose waters have flowed for fifteen centuries, and are flowing still?

What was the immediate result of that celebrated meeting? Persecution. All who would not adopt the foolish words of Eusebius's wolves, and preferred the words of the Holy Spirit, were driven into exile without mercy. Was this the work of Christ's flock? or was it the work of the "wolves" predicted by Christ and his apostle? The matter became still clearer even to the persecutors when, in three years, Constantine changed his mind, and turned his rage against Athanasius and the Homoousians. Constantius, his successor in the East, continued the persecution of the orthodox.

XIV. HILARY, Bishop of Poitiers, our fourteenth witness, thus addresses Constantius:

"It is a thing equally deplorable and dangerous, that there are as many creeds as opinions among men, as many doctrines as inclinations, and as many sources of blasphemy as there are faults among us, because we make creeds arbitrarily and explain them as arbitrarily. The Homoousion is rejected, and received, and explained away, by successive synods. The partial or total resemblance of the Father and the Son is a subject of dispute for these unhappy times. Every year, nay, every moon, we make new creeds to describe invisible mysteries. We repent of what we have done; we defend those who repent; we anathematize those whom we defended. We condemn either the doctrine in ourselves, or our own in that of others; and, reciprocally tearing each other to pieces, we have been the cause of each other's ruin!"*

* "Bishops and Councils," page 62.

This is the testimony of one of the best of the bishops. Will our Episcopalian refuse to believe him? The bishops left to themselves, or guided by Constantine and his sons, all fell "to tearing each other to pieces." Were they not the wolves of whom we are in search? Surely, they were not Christ's sheep. *They* do not tear each other to pieces. "By their fruits ye will come to know them." With one more testimony from the eloquent Hilary, we will conclude our demonstration. Describing the results of the State establishment of Christianity by Constantine, he says:

"The East and West are in a perpetual state of restlessness and disturbance. Deserting our spiritual charges, abandoning the people of God, neglecting the preaching of the Gospel, we are hurried about from place to place, sometimes to great distances; some of us infirm with age, with feeble constitutions or ill-health, and are sometimes obliged to leave our sick brethren on the road. The whole administration of the Empire, the emperor himself, the tribunes, and the commanders, at this fearful crisis of the State, are solely occupied with the lives and the condition of the bishops. The people are by no means unconcerned. The whole brotherhood watches, in anxious suspense, the event of these troubles; the establishment of post-houses is worn out by our journeyings, and all on account of a few wretches, who, if they had the least remaining sense of religion, would say with the prophet Jonah, 'Take us up, and cast us into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you; for we know that it is on our account that this great tempest is upon you!'"*

These sad confessions are the consequences of adversity. Had Constantine continued what is called orthodox, and persisted in persecuting the Arians; and had Hilary always had his own way, never would his eyes have been opened to his own misdeeds, as well as to those of his enemies. Episcopal nature does not essentially differ from human nature in general. When the bishops of England were down, where they richly deserved to be, under the mighty but magnanimous sway of Oliver Cromwell, Jeremy Taylor seemed to be as wise as he was certainly eloquent and learned, and wrote his immortal "Liberty of Prophesying." But when the son of the Episcopal "martyr" came back, when Charles II returned to his own dishonor and his country's ruin, the bishops came with him, but showed they had learned nothing by their trials. And Jeremy Taylor became Bishop of Down and Connor; and how did he carry out his "Liberty of Prophesying?" By stopping the mouths of all the Presbyterians in his dioceses.

* Hilary. Opera Hist. Fragm., XI, c. xxv.

We might go on indefinitely quoting the testimony of these witnesses to the wolfish nature of episcopacy when left to itself. We might call in Augustine refusing to allow a mitigation of the murderous decrees of the Empire against the Donatist Dissenters, which drove them in despair to burn their own churches and plunge into the flames. We might call in the pagan historian, Marcellinus, declaring that the ferocity of Christians against each other surpassed that of the most "savage wild beasts," and Jerome confirming the testimony by allowing that his patron, Pope Damasus, marched to the Papal throne over the bodies of both men and women. We might call in *Saint Cyril*, and demand, Did you not allow your monks to tear Hypatia, the most beautiful, eloquent, and learned woman of the age, limb from limb, in the streets of your Alexandria, and in your Council of Ephesus banish your rival, Nestorius, to Epipas, where he immediately died of your violence? We could point to Dioscorus, the nephew and successor of Cyril, whipping Saint Flavian, the successor of Nestorius, to death, in the Robber Council of Ephesus. Were the uncle and the nephew, perpetrating such crimes in Ephesus, not the fulfillers of Paul's prophecy, that the tearing wolves were to come in that very Church? And when we remember that these "wretches" (the word is Bishop Hilary's) carried on their butcheries in the name of the "Mother of God," *our Lord*, is it not undeniable that these were "the false prophets" foretold by that Lord, who were to come in his name, in sheep-skins, crying, Lord, Lord, but proving themselves the "tearing wolves" by their bloody deeds? We "pause for a reply."

[We depart from our usual custom in publishing a review of an article which has appeared in the *QUARTERLY*. We make this exception because the subject discussed is of the greatest importance, and the writers are both men of acknowledged learning and ability. Owing to certain intimations in the foregoing article, it is but fair to say that the author of the article on "Ecclesiastical Polity in the First Age" is not, and never was, a member of the Episcopal Church, but is a worthy member of the Christian Church, and a preacher of the very best reputation.—EDITOR.]

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Four Phases of Morals.* Socrates, Aristotle, Christianity, Utilitarianism. By JOHN STUART BLACKIE, F. R. S. E., Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 12mo. pp. 354.

As the science of religion is just now assuming the greatest importance, it is fitting that all the chief systems of morals should be thoroughly analyzed, and their comparative claims impartially considered. Dogmatism can no longer decide questions which modern learning and research have placed within the sphere of human reason; much less can religious faith be propagated at the expense of historical accuracy. Nothing, perhaps, characterizes this age more than the demand which is every-where made for candid and thorough investigation. Here and there, men of small minds and narrow view enter their protest against all disturbance of settled convictions; but such men are no longer very serious obstacles in the way of progress, since they have very largely ceased to have any influence on the thinkers of the age.

Pilate asked the question, "What is truth?" but before he could answer, he was intimidated by two classes of men, who have always been too ready to stifle honest convictions. The first was the priests, who said they had a law, and by that law Jesus should die, because he made himself the Son of God. The second was the political demagogues, who claimed that if Pilate let Jesus go, he was not Cæsar's friend. Thus did theological and political influences control judicial decision, until innocence was offered up to satisfy the demands of bigotry. These influences are not now as potent as they once were. We can ask the question to-day, What is truth? without the fear of religious legalism destroying our souls, or political partyism hanging us to the cross.

We think it is safe to say that such a book as Professor Blackie has written, could not have been produced twenty-five years ago. Then the study of comparative religions was in its infancy. Then the spell of dogmatism, which had so long held in bondage the human soul, was not suffi-

ciently broken to admit of impartial inquiry concerning the respective merits of religious systems. Now, however, the case is different. Recent discoveries have brought us into a new world of thought, and this thought is no longer seriously trammelled by the traditions of the Fathers. Hence, such works as we have before us may be reasonably expected, while their influence on coming generations must be wonderfully great.

Professor Blackie gives us, in the first place, a history of Socrates, and a careful analysis of his system of morals. This chapter is incomparably the ablest and most intelligent notice of Socrates we have ever seen, though, it must be confessed, it is a little too eulogistic in some places. After giving us an excellent sketch of the man, we are introduced to his mission in the following summary concerning the character and influence of the Sophists, with whom Socrates has sometimes been classed :

"But it is plain, from the very nature of the case, that the Sophists, so far as they went a step beyond the province of strict rhetoric, were placed in a position which rendered their moral and philosophical teaching a matter of just concern to all who were interested in the education of the youth of Athens, and in the character of her public men. Besides, among an impressible and excitable people like the Athenians, fond of display, and ambitious of popularity, the mere methodized art of talking, apart from any solid knowledge, and without any high moral inspiration, was a very dangerous engine to put into the hand of ambitious young politicians. And the fact unquestionably is, according to the concurrent testimony of Xenophon, Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle—in fact, of all antiquity—that these public teachers generally did dispense very shallow, and often very dangerous, doctrine. They were the natural birth of an age of movement and innovation; and in such an age, along with much that may operate as a healthy stimulant to progressive thought, there is always present a drastic admixture of the merely analytic, skeptical, and destructive element—a negative force, strong to impugn the validity of ancient foundations, but weak to establish any thing equally stable and effective in their place. By the negative and skeptical teachings of these men, Socrates found the youth of Athens shaken from their old moorings, and tossing about amid seas of perplexing doubt on the one hand, and unprincipled libertinism on the other. Every great principle of social order and human right that formerly had been received from venerated tradition, and believed by the co-operation of a healthy instinct with a hoary authority, was now denied; and the field was waiting for the appearance of a great constructive prophet, who should bring people back, through steps of scientific reasoning, to a living faith in those maxims of immutable morality which they had originally inherited with the blood from their fathers' veins, and the milk from their mothers' breasts. Such a prophet now appeared, and his name was Socrates."

It will be seen, by this extract, that Professor Blackie's view on this matter is different from that of Grote, in his *History of Greece*. In a footnote, the Professor reviews Grote at considerable length, and shows, as we think, conclusively, that the celebrated historian's view is not well founded.

We are next introduced to the following propositions, which, it is declared, contain the Socratic moral philosophy :

I. "Man is naturally a sympathetic and a social animal. He has, no doubt, strong, self-preserving, self-asserting, and self-advancing instincts, which, if left without counter-action, would naturally lead to isolation or mutual hostility, and ultimate extermination; but these instincts of isolated individualism are met by yet stronger instincts of sympathy, love, and fellowship, in the ascendancy of which the true humanity of man, as distinguished from tigerhood and spiderhood, consists.

II. "Man is naturally a reasoning animal, and is only then truly a man when his passions are tempered and his conduct regulated by reason. The function of reason is the recognition and the realization of truth; truth recognized in speculation is science; truth realized in action is a moral life and a well-ordered society."

These two propositions are sharply analyzed, and shown to contain the principles of a noble and heroic life, while their habitual denial as necessarily leads down to a base and brutish life.

It can not be denied that Professor Blackie is an ardent admirer of Socrates, and that this admiration sometimes leads him into an enthusiastic defense of the system of morals, which is scarcely justified by the facts in the case. Still, for the most part, we think his treatise is unanswerable, and is altogether the best that has ever been written upon the life and teachings of the great Grecian philosopher.

We are next introduced to Aristotle. Socrates was the man of action, Plato the man of literature, and Aristotle the man of science. Aristotle's system of morals adds very little to that of Socrates, but it is more distinctly scientific. What was simply living with Socrates, becomes a formulated system with Aristotle. What one originated, the other systematized and made practical.

The third chapter of Professor Blackie's book is devoted to a consideration of Christianity; and it is just here, where we least expected, that he gives us his most original thoughts and his most valuable generalizations. He considers "the distinctive character of Christianity as an ethical system—not in the fundamental, invariable, absolute types of right and wrong, which are the same every-where, but mainly in its method of operation, and in the steam-power, the strong convictions, the fervid passions by which the moral power is set in motion, and the particular virtues which its method of operation and its moral steam, in connection with the nature of the materials acted on, brings on the stage with a certain preference." It is declared that a world-regenerating system of ethics, such as Christianity, is not a thing like a treatise on logic, written in a book and laid on the shelf, and allowed quietly to work its way with whomsoever chooses to take it up. "It is an active, invasive, aggressive power; it is a strong medicine to knock down a strong disease; it is a charge of cavalry dashing onward, like a storm, to break the solid squares of an opposing infantry, bristling with many spears." It is from this personal, aggressive, impetuous point of view that our author looks at the Christian religion, and claims for it originality in its principles,—not so much as the methods it employs.

The following summary is worthy the most serious consideration:

I. "Let us inquire what is the steam-power, the lever, the motive force, of Christian ethics. And here at once the most distinctive part of the Christian, moral system meets us in the face; it is presented to us prominently, essentially, radically, as a religion. It is not merely connected with religion; not only, like the moral philosophy of Dr. Paley,

willing to stamp its precepts with a religious sanction, and to found moral obligation upon the will of the Supreme Being; much less, like the philosophy of Socrates, ready to fraternize with religion, and eager to prove, with Heraclitus, the profoundest of the pre-Socratic thinkers, that all human rules of conduct are derived ultimately from the necessity of the divine nature. It is more than all this. It is a religion; by its mere epiphany it forms a Church; in its starting-point, its career, and its consummation, it is 'a kingdom of heaven upon earth.' In its method of presentation, though not certainly in its contents, it is as different from its great ally, Platonism, as Platonism is from its great enemy, the Homeric theology; for Platonism, however nearly allied to Christianity, is a philosophy, and not a religion—a philosophy which did not even propose to overthrow the polytheistic faith, whose poet-theologer it had so rudely assaulted. The moral philosophy of the Greeks, indeed, generally, was either a simple wisdom of life in the form of precepts loosely strung together, as in the early Gnostic poets, or it was a wisdom of life deduced from principles of reason, as in all the Socratic and post-Socratic teaching. But the ethics of the Gospel came down upon men like a flash from heaven, suddenly, violently, fervidly, and explosively; not with a curious apparatus of slowly-penetrating arguments. There is no talk about reasons here at all; the *λόγος* of St. John came afterward, and meant a very different thing. '*Repent ye, and be baptized, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand!*' is the form of the evangelical appeal, in which no argument is attempted, or, indeed, required. Your conscience tells you that you are rebels against God; as rebels, you can only live under a curse; the whole sense-besotted Greek and Roman world is evidently lying under a curse; repent, and be converted; return to God, and be saved. To man there can be no safety any where except in God, who is the source of all good; and in Christ, who gave himself a living sacrifice that we might be redeemed from all evil. This is the whole style of the greatest moral Evangel the world has ever heard; absolutely and simply an act of religion. All immorality is departure from God, all morality return to God. In the Christian ethics, God is not a secondary figure; he is not brought in merely for a sanction; he is the central sun of the whole system, from whose bright fountain of perennial excellence all the little twinkling lamps of our minor moralities are lighted up. The individual virtues of a Christian man are merely the flower and the fruit of a living plant, of which the root is theology and the sap piety. Nay, more: the piety accompanies the flower and the fruit, and imparts to them a fragrance and a flavor which gives them more than half their charm. A rose without smell would still be a rose; but what a world of difference to the sense and to the sentiment would the absence of that fine invisible essence imply! Christian virtue, in fact, can no more exist without piety than Socratic virtue can exist without logic. Socrates was, no doubt, a remarkably pious man; but, while the piety of Socrates was a strong shoot from his reason, the virtue of a Christian is the fair issue of his piety." . . .

"And this brings us to the second important point in the original attitude of Christianity, and the manner in which it moved the moral world. This point is the historical foundation on which the moral appeal stood; and this historical foundation was the miraculous life, death, and resurrection of the Founder of the ethical religion. It concerns us not to inquire here whether Christ was a real person, or, as certain Germans, with their ingenious whimsicality, will have it, a mere myth; as little need we ask whether the miracles were really suspensions of the laws of nature, or were mere acts of remarkable power somewhat exaggerated by the wandering narrators; much less can it be necessary for the present argument to weigh the evidence for the great crowning miracle of the resurrection. Concerning these matters, every man must either judge for himself, or take the authority of nearly two thousand years of effective Christian teaching as a sufficient guarantee. But what we have to do with here is simply this: that these facts were believed, that the apostles stood upon these facts, and that the ethical efficiency of Christianity was rooted in these facts. Take the facts away, or the assured belief in the facts, and the existence of such an ethico-religious society as the Christian Church becomes, under the circumstances, impossible. Consider what an effect the personality of Socrates had in establishing what we, with no great license of language, may call the Socratic Church in Athens. The various schools of philosophy, first in Athens and then in Rome, were sects of that Church. Had Socrates not lived and died with visible power and effect before men, the existence of these

schools, fathered by this great teacher, would have been impossible. A person is the necessary nucleus round which all social organisms form themselves. But the personality of Socrates was a much less important element in the formation of the Socratic schools than that of Christ was in the formation of the Christian Church. Socrates was only a teacher—one who, like other teachers, might, in time, create disciples as wise, perhaps wiser, than himself. Christ was a redeemer, whose function, as such, could be performed by no vicar, and transmitted to no successor; the one was a help and a guide, the other a foundation of faith and a fountain of life. Socrates taught his disciples to become independent of him, and rely on their own perfected reason; from Christ his disciples always derive nourishment, as the branches from the vine. And if the relation of Christ to his disciples, conceived only as a living Savior walking on the earth, was so much closer than that of Socrates to his disciples, how much more intimate does the relation become when he, who lived and died to redeem humanity from sin, rose from the dead as a living guarantee that all who walked in his ways should follow up their redemption from sin by a speedy victory over that yet stronger enemy, death! From the moment that the resurrection stood amongst the disciples as an accepted fact, the Founder of the religion was not merely a wonder-working man, a prophet and the greatest of all the prophets, but he was an altogether exceptional and miraculous person; either God, in some mysterious way combined into an incorporate unity with man, or at least a person that, compared with the common type and expression of humanity, might pass for God. The influence which the belief in the actual existence of such a human, and yet in so many regards superhuman, character as the Founder of their faith must have exercised on the early preachers of the Gospel, can not easily be overestimated. Plato and Plotinus often talk of the raptures with which the human soul would be thrilled if not only, as now, the shadows and types of the Beautiful, but the very absolute Beautiful itself, the *αἰτὶ τὸ καλόν*, stood revealed to mortal sight. But granting, for the moment, that the manifestations of such a vague abstraction is possible, it is quite certain that, when manifested, it could not possibly act upon men with any thing like the power of a human Christ actually risen from the dead. Man, with all his range of imagination, is at bottom as much concrete as any creature, and as little capable of being moved by mere abstractions. Jesus Christ and him crucified, Christ risen from the dead, believe in him,—this was the short summation of that preaching of the Gospel which regenerated the then world, lying as it did in all sorts of wickedness. See how emphatically the resurrection is alluded to as the main anchor in all the early preachings of the apostles! (Acts ii, 32; iii, 15; iv, 2; v, 30, etc.) And as to St. Paul, he declares again and again that if Christ be not risen, the faith of Christians is vain, and those to whom the world was indebted for its moral regeneration were justly to be accounted amongst the most miserable of men; a method of speaking which plainly implies that, in the apostle's estimation, the firm fact of a risen Savior was the only real assurance that Christians had of a life beyond the grave. So true is the utterance of a distinguished modern divine, that 'the resurrection was the central point of the apostolic teaching; nay, more, the central point of history, primarily of religious history, of which it is the soul. The resurrection is the one central link between the seen and the unseen.' Let this, therefore, stand firm as the main principle of any just exposition of the machinery by which the ethics of the Gospel achieved the conquest of the world. The Church, 'the peculiar people zealous for good works,' of whom St. Peter speaks, was formed out of the world, not by the clear cogency of logical arguments, but by the vivid belief in miraculous facts."

The fourth and last chapter is devoted to a slashing review of Utilitarianism. In this chapter the author has shown a remarkable fitness for polemic writing; and we think it would be difficult to find a more incisive and thorough refutation of the Utilitarian philosophy than is contained in these pages. It is first shown that the name is a misnomer, and that Externalism should be substituted for it. Then the founders of the Utilitarian school are treated in regular order; and it must be evident to all thinking

men that Locke, Hartley, Paley, Hume, Bentham, Mill, and Bain, receive their just deserts.

The recent death of John Stuart Mill will lend an additional interest to the following concerning him.

"Among living thinkers, there is none who stands before the public more prominently as the exponent of the Utilitarian ethics than John Stuart Mill. But whatever may be the merits of this distinguished writer in the domain of logic, politics, and economics, which seem most cognate to his genius, there can be little doubt in the minds of thoughtful persons that his book on Utilitarianism has done more to undermine than to sustain the doctrine which it professes to expound. And the reason of this lies in a cause which is not less condemnatory of the doctrine than it is complimentary to its champion. Mr. Mill is too good a man to be the consistent advocate of a system which, as compared with other systems, is fundamentally bad. He is too earnest an apostle of the real moral progress of man to be a thorough-going disciple of a school whose natural element is epicurean ease, sensual indulgence, and prudential calculation. His heart revolted against the degrading tendency of a philosophy which gave a primary importance only to what is low, and left the highest elements of human nature to make a respectable show before men, with a borrowed and secondary vitality. But, at the same time, he was a disciple of the school, and a son of his father; and thus, by education and a sort of intellectual heritage, his head was committed to a doctrine for which his heart was naturally a great deal too good. The consequence was a sort of sophistry which, while we see through it, we can not but admire. Departing from the original idea of his school, that pleasure is the only good, and that pleasures differ from one another only in intensity, he interpolates into the general idea of quantity of happiness the discriminating element of quality, and thus is thrown back, virtually, on those innate ideas which it is the characteristic boast of his school to have discarded. For the essential difference in the quality of high and low pleasures is not a matter to be proved by any external induction, but springs directly out of the intellectual and emotional nature of man, asserting its own innate superiority precisely as light asserts itself over darkness, and order over confusion. And thus, while he defends Utilitarianism successfully, so far as results go, he succeeds only by throwing overboard all that is most distinctive in the doctrine, and adopting, secretly, all that is most peculiar to the teaching of his opponents."

We have only space to say that the book, as a whole, is worth a place in every student's library, and ought to produce a very healthy influence upon the minds of all who carefully read it.

2.—*Autology: An Inductive System of Mental Science*, whose Center is the Will, and whose Completion is the Personality. A Vindication of the Manhood of Man, the Godhood of God, and the Divine Authorship of Nature. By REV. D. H. HAMILTON, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. Cincinnati: Geo. E. Stevens & Co. 1873. 8vo. pp. 701.

To popularize mental science is, indeed, a very difficult task. In fact, it is questionable whether such a thing is possible, and, even if possible, it is by no means certain that it will ever be done. Some of the most important matters connected with the science have not been settled, and from present appearances are not likely to be, this side of the Millenium. At

that time, we suppose, antagonism among metaphysicians will cease, as we are all then to

"Hang the trumpet in the hall
And study war no more."

"Another system of mental science!" We know that this is fearful news to our readers, but we have tried to break it as delicately as possible. Still it becomes us to deal frankly. The substantial volume before us makes just the announcement for which we have been preparing the reader. Here is an extract:

"This work is original in that it brings out new truth, and re-states, re-defines, and uses old truths in such a way that they have the force of new ones. It is not, therefore, simply another volume on a known subject, but decidedly a new system of mental science, having a distinct and thoroughly marked individuality."

This "originality" will be found to consist in a number of items, such as that the mind begins to act and know, "through the two primordial elements, essential activity, and essential intelligence," and that it makes these two "primordial elements" the "spiritual, vital, and dynamical forces, by which the whole system of mental science, and the whole manhood of man, soul and body, are developed, built up, and completed in one unity and identity of being and life." There you have it; and it makes no difference whether you can ever understand what "essential activity" and "essential intelligence" are, you must, nevertheless, at once see the originality of this system; for it reduces all action and knowing to "two primordial elements." That is about as near the start of things as we ever expect to get, and hence we are profoundly grateful to our author for this luminous definition. But this "essential activity" and "essential intelligence" cut quite a figure in the author's doctrine of the Will, while the intellect and conscience are set forth as qualities developed from the will by the ceaseless life-force and intelligence of these same "primordial elements."

The intellect is made to consist of two parts—the consciousness and the reason; and the subject of knowing is divided into the absolute knowing of primary facts by the consciousness, and absolute knowing of ideas by the reason. It is declared that "the conscience is the highest faculty of the mind, and it is the ultimate outgrowth of all the preceding faculties. It is formed by the final coming together and last coalescence of the original elements of essential activity and essential intelligence, after they have formed all the other faculties, and as they crop out at the summit of the soul, completing its development as a competent and accountable being."

The following summary gives us the author's conception of the elements of the complete will:

- First.* Essential activity, or life.
- Second.* Essential intelligence, or consciousness.
- Third.* Essential individuality, self, or authorship, or proprietorship.
- Fourth.* Essential self-law, or end of action.
- Fifth.* Essential liberty, or self-disposition.

The system involves the existence of a personal God; and the argument on this subject is very able and conclusive.

The author attempts to illustrate every thing, so as to make himself understood by the general reader. We hope the general reader will be more successful than some metaphysicians are likely to be.

-
- 3.—*The Reformation.* By GEORGE P. FISHER, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 1873. 8vo. pp. 620.

SUCH a work as this claims to be, has long been greatly needed. Not that histories of the Reformation are wanting—there are certainly plenty of these—but there has been hitherto no fine generalization of that great religious movement within such a space as to make it available to the general student. There have been a few attempts to supply this need, but they have not been as successful as we could wish. They have either left a great many important things entirely unnoticed, and given too much prominence to matters of very small consequence, or else they have been tedious in details without any proper classification of events such as enables the student to form an intelligent estimate of the period of history he is studying. Professor Fisher has happily avoided these extremes. His work is full enough for all the practical purposes of a hand-book, and yet it is comparatively free from tiresome details. In short, it is a good plan, well executed.

While the work is valuable on many accounts, not the least value is its admirable sketches of the principal actors in the Reformation. These portraits of persons have rarely, if ever, been excelled. They are, in fact, life-like pictures, and have the effect to almost reproduce the age of the Reformation in living panorama before the reader.

Professor Fisher claims to have written his work without any theological bias; and it must be conceded that, in the main, this claim is just. While here and there we think we see a slight coloring not unlike that which is supposed to emanate from Yale College, still, as there is so little of this, it ought not to be urged as an objection to the book, or as invalidating the author's claim to impartiality.

One thing the professor has not attempted to do; namely, to shield the Reformers from grave faults and infirmities. Nor has he attempted to defend many things in their various theological systems. He has, apparently at least, recognized the fact that every successful reformation must be a gradual development. A few germinal truths are eliminated in the first place, and from these the movement takes its start. Years afterward, it may assume consistent proportions, but surely not during the life-time

of those who begin the movement. History develops a curious fact with respect to progression. It has ever been that only one or two sides of truth come into view at the same time. Hence, reformations have always been one-sided. One or two points have chiefly claimed the attention of the Reformers of a period, while the Reformers of another period have been engaged at something else. This is precisely as it ought to be. Every thing can not be accomplished by one man, nor can we expect that fifty years are sufficient to find out and develop all the truth that is needed.

The Lutheran Reformation was a success in a few things, and these were the things chiefly attempted. That there was much to be done in bringing the Church out of the wilderness to the faith and practice of the primitive Christians, even after the first Reformers had performed their mission, will scarcely be doubted by any one at all acquainted with the facts in the case. The attempt to crystallize every reform movement in an authoritative enunciation called a Creed, is both unphilosophical and hurtful, and can only result in the hinderance of the progress of truth. Let each movement have full credit for what is accomplished, but let it be regarded as only a partial return to that complete revelation of truth found in the Word of God. After a while it may be that the sum of what has been respectively accomplished by these movements will give us precisely what was lost when the Church wandered away into the wilderness.

-
- 4.—*Systematic Theology*. By CHARLES HODGE, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Vol. III. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1873. 8vo. pp. 880.

TAKEN altogether, Dr. Hodge's work is the most pretentious on the subject of Theology that has been published in the United States. It can not be denied that it is a work of very marked ability; still it is not likely to exert much influence on the theology of the future. It is entirely too much of a fossil. It lacks the vitality of the living presence. Not because it does not discuss living issues, but because its treatment of these is according to dead theories—theories that have long since been exploded, and ought to have been abandoned by right-thinking men.

The present volume opens with a chapter on Regeneration, which is valuable only so far as it gives us a clear statement of the various views held on that subject. Dr. Hodge is himself a close follower of Augustine. Regeneration is with him as much a miracle as the giving of sight to the blind, or raising Lazarus from the dead.

The chapter on Baptism is a curious mixture of sound reasoning and shallow excuses for a questionable practice. We ought not to expect a better argument than the doctor has given us for infant baptism. It is

difficult to find reasons for that for which there are no reasons. Hence, it would be unfair in us to expect any one to make out from the Scriptures the case of infant baptism.

But the doctor does better on the design of baptism. While much he has written might have been omitted, the following is worthy to be copied into these pages.

"Baptism is a sign. It signifies the great truths that the soul is cleansed from the guilt of sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and purified from its pollution by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. The Bible teaches that God sanctifies and saves men through the truth; that the spirit works with and by the truth in conveying to men the benefits of redemption. It matters not whether that truth be brought before the mind by hearing or reading it, or in the use of significant, Divinely appointed emblems. The fact and the method of the deliverance of the children of Israel from their bondage in Egypt were as clearly taught in the sacrament of the Passover, as in the written words of Moses. So the fundamental truths just mentioned are as clearly and impressively taught in the sacrament of baptism as in the discourses of our blessed Lord himself. It is, therefore, just as intelligible how the spirit makes the truth signified in baptism the means of sanctification, as how he makes that same truth, as read or heard, an effectual means of salvation. The spirit does not always co-operate with the truth as heard, to make it a means of grace; neither does He always attend the administration of baptism with his sanctifying and saving power.

"Baptism is a seal or pledge. When God promised to Noah that he would never again drown the world in a deluge, he set the rainbow in the heavens as a pledge of the promise which he had made. When he promised to Abraham to be a God to him and to his seed after him, he appointed circumcision as the seal and pledge of that promise. So when he promised to save men by the blood of Christ and by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, he appointed baptism to be not only the sign, but also the seal and pledge of those exceeding great and precious promises. No believer in the Bible can look on the rainbow without having his faith strengthened in the promise that a deluge shall never again destroy the earth. No pious Jew could witness the rite of circumcision administered, or advert to that sign in his own person, without an increased confidence that Jehovah was his God. And no Christian can recall his own baptism, or witness the baptism of others, without having his faith strengthened in the great promises of redemption. Every time the ordinance of baptism is administered in our presence, we hear anew the voice from heaven proclaiming, 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin;' he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

"Baptism, however, is not only a sign and a seal, it is also a means of grace, because in it the blessings which it signifies are conveyed, and the promises of which it is the seal are assured or fulfilled to those who are baptized, provided they believe. The Word of God is declared to be the wisdom and power of God to salvation; it is the means used by the Holy Spirit in conferring on men the benefits of redemption. Of course, all who merely hear or read the Word of God are not saved; neither do all who receive the water experience the baptism of the Holy Ghost; but this is not inconsistent with the Word's being the means of salvation, or with baptism's being the washing of regeneration. Our Lord says we are sanctified by the truth. Paul says we put on Christ in baptism. (Gal. iii, 27.) When a man receives the Gospel with a true faith, he receives the blessings which the Gospel promises. When he receives baptism in the exercise of faith, he receives the benefits of which baptism is the sign and seal. Unless the recipient of this sacrament be insincere, baptism is an act of faith—it is an act in which and by which he receives and appropriates the offered benefits of the redemption of Christ. And, therefore, to baptism may be properly attributed all that in the Scriptures is attributed to faith. Baptism washes away sin (Acts xxii, 16); it unites to Christ and makes us the sons of God (Gal. iii, 26, 27); we are therein buried with Christ (Rom. vi, 3); it is, according to one interpretation of Titus iii, 5, the washing of

regeneration. But all this is said on the assumption that it is what it purports to be—an act of faith. The Gospel of our salvation is—to those who believe not—a savor of death unto death. Circumcision to the unbelieving Jew was uncircumcision. Baptism without faith is without effect. Such being the case, it is plain that baptism is as truly a means of grace as the Word. It conveys truth to the mind; it confirms the promise of God, and it is the means in the hands of the spirit of conveying to believers the benefits of redemption. Hence, it is a grievous mistake and a great sin to neglect or undervalue it."

-
- 5.—*The Holy Bible*, according to the Authorized Version (A. D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. By BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH. Edited by F. C. COOK, M. A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. II. *Joshua—1 Kings*. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. E. Stevens & Co. 1873. Royal 8vo. pp. 624.

WE do not think that this volume is equal in value to the one which preceded it; still it is by far the best Commentary on the books treated we have ever seen. The notes do not seem always to have the terseness which was characteristic of the first volume, nor do they seem to hit so exactly upon the thing which needs explanation; still there is little left for learning and candor to accomplish within the same space.

Of course, the books of this volume are not equal in interest to the Pentateuch, nor is there the same scope for erudition and originality. We ought not, therefore, to look for a volume of as much interest to the Bible student as we would have a right to expect if some other portions of the Bible were treated. When these things are taken into consideration, it must be evident to the candid critic that the present volume is the fulfillment of the promise which the first one gave to the public; namely, that the Bible Commentary will be the best practical Commentary that has ever been published.

-
- 6.—*Sermons*. By REV. H. R. HAWES, M. A., Incumbent of St. James, Westmoreland Street, Marylebone, London. New York: Holt & Williams. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 12mo. pp. 347.

WHATEVER else may be said of this book, it can not be charged with dullness. It is what would be styled, in common parlance, a live book—one which not only deals with present issues, but treats them in an off-hand, ready style, well calculated to attract and please the people.

The author has evidently had a vision that the old theologies will not do; but he as yet only sees men as trees walking. He has not a very clear view of what is needed. He represents what is known in England as the Broad Church, and is sometimes certainly broad enough for all practical purposes. It is clear that he has no love for many of the old dogmas that have so long held sway over the souls of men; but, in his iconoclastic fury to get rid of the past, he gives us very little that is worth any thing for

the present. In fact, here seems to be the trouble with all these rationalistic preachers. They are quite effective in demolishing the Old, but they seem to have very imperfect conceptions as to what the New should be. Still we do not undervalue their work. It may be necessary to get rid of that which is old and ready to vanish away, before it is possible to eliminate the true idea of the Church of the future.

This volume of Mr. Haweis will scarcely fail to stimulate intellectual activity, but is not likely to produce a very profound sensation, since it is neither a model of rhetoric nor a marvel of logic.

-
- 7.—*Year-book of Nature and Popular Science for 1872.* Edited by JOHN C. DRAPER, M. D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. E. Stevens & Co. 1873. 12mo. pp. 333.

THIS is one of the best classified Year-books we have seen; and as it is of convenient size, it ought to be very popular with all students of natural science. It contains a well-arranged and copious Index, which, with the Table of Contents, enables the student to readily find any thing he desires. We commend the book as altogether trustworthy and valuable.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Carl Immanuel Nitzsch; eine Lichtgestalt der neueren deutsch-evangelischen Kirchengeschichte. Dargestellt von WILLIBALD BEYSLAG.* (Carl Immanuel Nitzsch; a Luminary of the Modern German Evangelical Church. By WILLIBALD BEYSLAG.) Berlin: Ludwig Rauh. 1872. 8vo. pp. 485.

As the title of this biography declares, Carl Immanuel Nitzsch* is one of the luminous forms, a bright, shining light in the Protestant Church of Germany of this century. As a man of great learning, especially in all that pertains to theology, as a writer and professor in his chosen field, he was a man of special prominence and power among the many eminent theologians of his day in Germany. His death has left no common void, and one that will not soon be filled. There was an illustrious circle of men in Germany to which he belonged; all, or almost all, now gone, from old Neander to Nitzsch, the latest fallen, a crown of glory to that great land. What immense treasures their vast labors, so constant, so profound, so prolific, have left to their people and to the religious world! When we look over the record of their intellectual industry, it is amazing to see what

*Pronounced like the word *niche*.

these men have produced. It does strike us that, in comparison with the men of other lands, the German scholars, in general, show an extraordinary intellectual industry, both in the massiveness and amount of their products. It may be, as men say, in their national character; but it certainly is owing more directly to the habits of toil enjoined and cultivated in the methods of education, from the very beginning onward; as with Nitzsch, from earliest boyhood, under the paternal hand, up through special house instructors, gymnasium, and university, it begins and ends only with life itself. Think of the boy Nitzsch writing elegant Latin, with ease, at fifteen; and let no one hastily think, as many are apt to do, that Latin or Greek was all; this is only an indication of what is going on, at that early day of a life devoted to learning, all around, in the general circle of culture. That makes men to whom solid intellectual activity becomes the very current of life—life itself. What such men do for the world is well known. What is here said does not imply a justification of all in the German methods of education, especially in theology; far from it; but this is meant, that in habits of thorough, patient, laborious industry, from boyhood to old age, German education is an example to the world, especially to the Western world, where higher education, as it is called, is so very often, by universal desire and imperious demand, so excessively superficial, easy, and hurried, while certainly common education is, in many respects, more practical than in the Old World. Germany furnishes us with an extraordinary number of examples of what is always so interesting and instructive, of families illustrated by a succession of learned men, and not seldom by a number of these as contemporaries. The cause of this, we think, lies in the fact that in Germany, among the men of learning, whose chief and only wealth usually is their learning, the habit of devoting themselves in the family, in the "father house," with all paternal piety, to the education of their children, especially their sons, consecrating them to learning as the ancients consecrated their sons to patriotism, is, perhaps, in the depth and self-sacrificing diligence of this devotion, more common than elsewhere. This is but one of the many interesting manifestations of the intense development of family life and family piety among the German people. The father, in his own deep love and high appreciation of learning, longs to transmit it as the noblest legacy to his sons; and his own example is often the best incentive, the piety of the son meeting that of the father for the same noble end. How many illustrious examples does German history afford of this! And to these belong the family of Nitzsch. Carl Ludwig, the father of the subject of this biography, was a man whose name stands high in the annals of the German Protestant Church,* and the name Nitzsch is honorably traced through the last three centuries of German history.

* See the notice of his life and works in *Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie*.

In introducing the history of Nitzsch, the author says:

"The present century of the Evangelical Church and theology forms, above all in Germany, a transition period that in Church history has scarcely its equal. Beginning with an internal, all-penetrating dissolution of the traditional, it received as its task the work of rejuvenation and renovation, which it has not as yet been able successfully to accomplish; and thus it embraces a history of agitation and conflict, full of hopeful beginnings and bitter disappointments. The oppositions of the Old and the New, the positive and the critical, the general and the individual, come before us in many forms, seek a reconciliation, and reject the one apparently gained, only to enter into a yet fiercer conflict with each other. . . . To traverse such a period of the immediate past in the track of the development of a personal life, which stood forth in the full stream of the tide, receiving into itself its full influence and acting a prominent part, promises instruction and the correction of errors; and so much the more since this life-history not only reflects in full the agitation of its days, but at the same time the full peace that was possible in it; and, in the midst of a thousand contradictions and imperfections of the age, gives the impression of inward harmony and progress to perfection.

"We are attempting to write the history of a man of whom, within the limits of the theological and ecclesiastical life, what has just been said is true, perhaps, above all his contemporaries. If some few have excelled him in some directions in creative power, none have surpassed him in universality of gifts and virtues, in symmetry of religious and moral energy, of speculative and historical disposition of mind, of scientific and ecclesiastical experience and enthusiasm; none, above all, in the nobility and unction that, with an all-penetrating, all-surpassing power of character, he gave to all his thoughts and actions. For half a century CARL IMMANUEL NITZSCH stood forth in the often storm-swept tide with the superior calmness of a Christian sage, a venerable form elevated above all the rage of party passions. And to none of the men that took an active part in the conflict of the times did those of all parties, who were capable of reverence, bow more willingly and more unanimously than to him. . . . May a grateful pupil not have too much overestimated his powers, in attempting to portray the bright image of a German Evangelical Christian, preacher, and theologian of the nineteenth century, for the present and succeeding ages!"

To understand the life of Nitzsch, our author gives us a picture of the religious and theological state of Germany during the first decades of this century:

"Let us trace, briefly, the theological situation with which it was the mission of Nitzsch, when about thirty years of age, with the force and in the spirit of an independent character, to grapple.

"The most widely extended, and, in external appearance, the most powerful tendency, was still the Kantian rationalism. It yet controlled, while the old supernaturalism was dying out, with almost unlimited sway, the pulpits, the consistories, the theological chairs, and journals. Nevertheless, in its essential being it had already been vanquished, not only in the intellectual and spiritual life of the best of the German people, but also in its theology. Schleiermacher, the great disciple, both of the Moravians and of human philosophy, had rescued theology from the rationalistic self-dissolution, in giving to it an independent foundation and origin, by showing that religion was independent of metaphysics and moral philosophy, and restoring to it a positive Christian nature and life by leading back Christian piety and communion to the original historical Redeemer as its life-center. But scarcely had this strange theology, that to the freest application of historical and philosophical criticism united the deepest mystical feeling, unassailable by either, fully declared itself, when it met with the keenest opposition from two directions, not only from the older effete stand-points—which, of course, could not comprehend or accept it, and at one time discovered in it mysticism, at another pantheism—but from two equally new tendencies which were themselves no less opposed to these old stand-points; namely, the pietistic and speculative. The pietistic current that ran so powerfully through the youthful religious awakening, and

where it made theology insisted always on Biblical, and soon more and more also on ecclesiastical orthodoxy, took offense at Schleiermacher's position to the Holy Scriptures, at its deriving religious truth not from the written word, but from the Christian consciousness, and also at what was necessarily connected with this position—the critical freedom with which it treated the traditional facts and doctrines. The speculative tendency, perfected in Hegel and his school, accepted for itself the theology of Schleiermacher, the separation between religious and philosophical knowledge, by which the truth and perfection of both seemed to be endangered, and ventured from its principles to arrive at far more objective and orthodox results. In both oppositions there were elements of truth, but still greater ones of a misconception and an abandonment of the great results gained by Schleiermacher. It was therefore natural and opportune that a theological group should be formed which, without overlooking those elements of truth, should hold fast to these secured results, and labor for their further development and use—a group of the so-called reconciliation-theologians. United not by the constraining bonds of a *school*, but rather by a free unity of sentiment, these theologians were distinguished from both the other parties by their profession, at the same time, of a full Christian faith in the saving truth of the Gospel, and their accepting the scientific culture of the age. While the pietists, in the name faith, despised and condemned the latter, and the speculative theologians, on the contrary, degraded Christianity to a mere element of culture that would be reached by philosophy, it was the principle of these theologians, who in a free way held to Schleiermacher, to recognize both the unchangeable Christian faith and the present scientific culture in their undiminished rights, and by a fundamental, honest reconciliation of the two, to labor for the further perfection of a sound theology, and, by means of this, for the renovation of the life of the Church.

"The merit of collecting this theological group and of summoning them to a united work for theology and the Church, belongs to Ullmann and Umbreit, of Heidelberg, two men united in the closest bonds of friendship; and it was done by founding the *Theologischen Studien und Kritiken*.*

While all the other "schools" were well provided with literary "organs" in the form of monthlies and quarterlies, generally edited with ability, the young theology of faith and progress had hitherto been without such a powerful aid in a land where literature is so mighty. The *Studien und Kritiken* marks a memorable era, both in its foundation and its splendid history to the present hour. One of the noblest publishers of Germany, Friedrich Perthes, of Gotha—a man of the rarest qualities of head and heart, who has, as a publisher, done for Germany what few others have done, in supporting, with courage, a high intelligence, and a splendid liberality, the noble cause of true progress by the press—at once met the proposal of Ullmann and Umbreit to be the publisher of their new journal. These men invited Lücke, Nitzsch, and Gieseler, of the University of Bonn, to be fellow-laborers with them, and these at once consented. "At a conference at Rüdesheim, in the Summer of 1827," at which, we presume, the generous *Rüdesheimer* was not wanting as a source of inspiration, "the plan of the *Studien und Kritiken* was finally decided on, and, in 1828, the new quarterly opened its career with the famous article of Ullmann on the Sinlessness of Jesus." These brave men stood together by this masterly journal till one by one passed away. The great work their common labors

*This German Theological Quarterly has been frequently noticed in the CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

have accomplished for a better faith and a better theology in Germany, and in which this Quarterly has had no small share, is now known and recognized; its triumphs and noble fruits will endure.

Dr. Beyschlag, one of the evangelical professors of Halle, and a successor of these noble men in the control of the *Studien und Kritiken*, in writing this book has done a work of love and of piety to the great departed. Not only his eminent intellectual and literary power, but his heart also, is felt in this monument he has raised to his illustrious friend, teacher, and father in the faith and in Christ. We are sorely tempted to add here some of the rich passages of the book, but space forbids.

On the 2d of August, 1868, Carl Immanuel Nitzsch passed away, at the rich, ripe age of eighty-one years. Let us conclude this notice of the book, that piety has written to make known this great life to mankind of to-day and hereafter, in the words with which Nitzsch himself concluded his eloquent tribute to Neander at his open grave:

"The whole of this noble life stands now finished before us; and, as one who has finished his course, he calls to us to lift up our hearts before the Lord in fullest gratitude. To whom was he not teacher, to whom not example? Such men, in all fullness, so highly gifted, so faithful, are seldom given to us. . . . He stands before us as the man who, from one night-watch to the other, is anxiously looking for the dawn from on high! We see him yet; how in him the word was true: 'Seek for that which is from above, not that which is from the earth.'"

And who is there among us—what youth, what mature man, what one called to noble aims—who does not need to take true greatness into his eye, and see it confirmed that greatness has its roots in simplicity and humility?
Have pia anima!

2.—*Geschichte der Predigt in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands, von Luther bis Spener.* (History of the pulpit in the Evangelical Church of Germany, from Luther to Spener, etc. By CLEMENS GOTTLIEB SCHMIDT.) Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes. 1872. 12mo. pp. 217.

It is not to be expected that in a single volume, especially one of such limited dimensions, a satisfactory view of the German Evangelical pulpit of two centuries could be given. Nothing will supply the absence of actual examples of sermons to give us any thing like a real idea of what these pulpit orators were. The author has not done this, but has limited himself to brief biographies and "characteristics;" that is, descriptions of the character of these men as preachers. In this respect, the book is valuable, and is read with interest. Such works as that of the brothers Brandt, a collection in many volumes of the best specimens of the old and the modern German Evangelical pulpit, under the several topics of the Christian Year, although not always judiciously selected and systematically arranged, must supply what this book does not give. The biographies and "*charakteristiken*" given in this book give us an idea of the chief men who have illustrated

the German Protestant pulpit for the first two centuries of its history. What our author has done, seems done with intelligence and conscientiousness. There have been some eminent pulpit orators in Germany, but not very many. It must be confessed that, as a general thing, *power* in the pulpit to move men—what we understand by real oratory—is a rare thing in Germany. Now and then, men like the late Krummacher rise above the general dull level; but these are rare exceptions. The old dreary *schlendrian* of dry moralizing, of good but weak pious exhortations, of commonplace doctrinal teaching, is, alas! too much the general order of the day, as it has been for generations. Doubtless there is here in America, and in England, another extreme—the wild, vaporizing, passionate rant, where the blind emotions, not the intelligence, bear sway and are addressed, and much evil is done; but the pulpit in America, with all its faults, is a tenfold greater power for religious intelligence and religious life than the German pulpit. The abominable system of Church and State, and of bringing every body into the Church at and by virtue of birth, rests like a fatal incubus on Church, pulpit, and all religious life. There is no motive for extraordinary pulpit power. The everlasting worry about ecclesiastical and theological questions takes up all attention, and kills off every other concern. As long as the fanatical old king and kaiser of Berlin sits with the dead weight of his authority, “By the grace of God,” on the top of the Church—it under him, and (as Homer’s Pelion upon Ossa, and both on Olympus, to gain heaven) Bismarck on the top of the kaiser—ruling and governing the Church, the pulpit will be an emasculated, miserable thing, as it has been under such bondage for generations. It is only when some extraordinary stir of religious revolution or awakening occurs, as in the days of Luther, or, to some extent, during the last decades, that we find the stir of life in the German pulpit. Some extraordinary men, of course, break through every opposing restraint.

Let us repeat one thought: Where the *Church* has not to grapple with the *world* all around it, to convert it to Christ, the first chief motive for the development of power in the pulpit is wanting. Now, this is precisely the case in these State Churches, where every one is carried by virtue of natural birth, in early infancy—in Germany, as a rule, in the first days of life—into the Church. The ministry is not sent forth to convert the world and bring it into the Church; *every thing is in the Church*, except Jews; and on that score, again, the rule, then, is a fixed sentiment insisted on by general opinion, *and often enforced by the State*—no proselyting from other denominations! All is at a dead stand-still. Hear what Tholuck says of the great Lutheran Church in Germany. He says it is

“A huge corpse, stiff, cold, pale; what appears in many of its limbs as life, is the life of putrefaction itself that is dissolving its limbs. Only in the midst of dying members is there yet, here and there, a living one, that with difficulty is keeping off death, or is seeking to

infuse the freshness of life in the dead parts all around it." (Tholuck, Predigten, Band I, 525; Hamburg, 1843.)

And such, alas! has too long and too generally been the state of religion in the Old World of Church and State religions, and where all is Church and all world. We might certainly suppose that the terribly widespread and extreme and blasphemous infidelity of Germany would give the pulpit some motive for life; but it is not so in any notable degree. Primitive Christianity, that will put Christ, and not Kaiser William, on the throne of the Church, that will sever between the Church and world, that will make spiritual conversion the condition of entrance into the Church, and that will, finally, throw the Church on its own resources of piety, zeal, and devotion, alone will regenerate the Church and give power to the pulpit.

We have space to add only an extract or two from the much of interest this book contains. Of course, the chief character of the book is Luther himself. The following passage is interesting and instructive:

"We have to do here chiefly with Luther as *preacher*, and the eminence that he also here reached; and what he did for his own and after ages, in this respect, we will know the better how to estimate if we keep always two things before our eyes—the deep decay into which the German pulpit had fallen, and also the very limited means he had at his command to create a new era in this field. With reference to the first point, we shall not judge unfairly when we designate the period before Luther, as regards the pulpit, one of deep decay. Religion had become a dead formality, through the ignorance and immorality of its teachers. While this ignorance was not the entire absence of all elementary education, the want of all higher culture is the more striking. Scholasticism, that had never received life-form in a higher literary culture, now sank into complete death, or, at least, produced more tares than wheat; for if, even in the Middle Ages, we met with some eminent names, as Bernard de Clairvaux, John Tauler, and others, these bright points only reveal the more the terrible darkness and deep misery of all the rest. Is it to be wondered that human folly instead of Divine wisdom, human science instead of Christian knowledge and experience, displayed their vanity in the pulpit, when the most learned made it their renown instead of preaching the Word of God, to expound Aristotle to their flocks, as was done at Tübingen, Ingolstadt, and elsewhere; and instead of leading their hearers to the Holy Scriptures, introduced them to the writings of Thomas Aquinas, Scotus Erigena, and others, as is reported from Zurich and other places; and when the most pious of their day—a John Gailer, of Kaisersberg, preacher in Strasburg, who died 1540—could bring himself, neglecting even of Bible text, in 1489, actually to preach on Sebastian Brant's '*Ship of Narra-gonia, navicula sive speculum fatuorum*?' * 'Men were ashamed,' says Luther, in his '*Table-talk*,' 'and considered it inappropriate, effeminate, and a disgrace to name Christ in the pulpit.' That the pulpit, which, in the course of time, had degenerated more and more into worldliness, regained again its Christian character; that the trivial commonplaces and 'pulpit-tricks' (as Erasmus calls them) were replaced by the unction of the Christian spirit, and the mass of profane learning by the simplicity of the Divine Word and the victorious power of Biblical truth; in one word, that intelligent order was brought into this chaos, a bright light into this darkness, a new life into these dead bones,—was Luther's work. He restored again the evangelical idea of the Church and the preacher's office, sought for both in the Bible, and accepted the office of preaching decidedly as the *ministry of the Word*. . . . Since Saint Augustine's work—'*De doctrina Christiana*'—not a single book had appeared that had done any noteworthy service for Homiletics."

"With reference to the duty of condescending in Christian charity to the oftentimes low level of culture and intelligence of the common man, we may recall the following words

* "The Ship of Fool land," a biting satire on manners; a book famous at that time.

of Luther: 'An upright, pious, faithful preacher, that teaches God's word in purity and clearness, must fix his eye on children and servants, and on the poor, common, ignorant multitude, who need instruction. He must suit himself to these, as a mother that quiets her child—talks and plays with it, gives it milk from her breast, but does not give it wine or malmsey.' At another time he says: 'When we preach to the rude, dull crowd, we must picture, paint, chew every thing for them, so as, if possible, to make them understand; it always does some good. To the intelligent it is easy to preach.' Again: 'It is not every one's affair to preach *powerfully*, since Divine gifts and instruments differ;' but one thing he demanded of all, 'to preach with *simplicity*.' Therefore, he blamed Zwingle, who wove Greek, Hebrew, and Latin into his sermons; but he praised Dietrich, Moerlin, and others, who so preached that the common man could understand them."

Luther had no forbearance with men who took a text as a kind of "motto," and then ran away from it, to wander about every-where. "A preacher," he said, "must stick to his proposition, his subject, and carry out what he has before him, that that may be well understood." He denounces the preachers who "*nimis procul a proposito discedunt*, and want to say all they know at once; but this is a poor business, and accomplishes nothing." He says: "In my sermons I take pains to have a passage before me; I cling to this; I remain *in statu* only with my theme, with the chief point and matter, about which I have proposed to speak."

It is remarkable what clear views Luther had of the office of preaching. His maxims, here repeated, are needed again in our day, where there is such a wide-spread demoralization of the pulpit, and in the very things rebuked by Luther. Preaching from texts as "mottoes," displaying scraps of learning, struggling for a vain show "to tell all one knows" in a sermon, and even Erasmus's "pulpit tricks and low witticisms and jests," and preaching on Brant's *navicula fatuorum*—that is, on topics entirely outside the Bible—all these abominations are rife in our day and land. We would like to see the great Saxon, in his just wrath, take some of these great and little pulpit apes by the neck, and give them their deserts.

MAGAZINES.

1.—*La Revue Chrétienne*. March, April, May.

IN the April number is the first, in the May number the second, of three discourses on the "Unity of the Church," by De Pressensé. In the first he treats of "The Basis and the Conditions of True Evangelical Catholicity;" in the second, of "The Obstacles to the Formation of True Evangelical Catholicity in the Church of To-day." In the April and May numbers are two excellent articles on "Hebrew Poetry," by Ch. Bois; and in the May number an instructive review by Dr. Lichtenberger of "The Confessions" of Dr. Strauss. The "Review of the Month" in each number, by De Pressensé, is always interesting, and is generally a good *resumé* of the "situation," politically and religiously.